Boston Public Library
3 9999 10522 712 6

PER. RM/G
No. AP2.N7
V.155
1892
THE TRVSTEES OF THE PVBLIC LIBRARY OMNIVM LVX CIVIVM OF THE CITY OF BOSTON 1852 1878

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

VOL. CLV.

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

RE-ESTABLISHED BY ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

EDITED BY LLOYD BRYCE.

VOL. CLV.

PUBLISHED
AT THE
CITY OF NEW YORK

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
No. 3 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET.
1892.

NOV 10 1964

Per. Dept.
*AP2
.N7
Vol. 155

Vol. 155
X6460

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE.

All rights reserved.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXVIII.

JULY, 1892.

WHAT SHALL THE RATIO BE?

THE QUESTION OF THE CONFERENCE.

BY SENATOR STEWART, OF NEVADA; REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, OF ILLINOIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS; SENATOR H. C. HANSBOROUGH, OF NORTH DAKOTA; REPRESENTATIVE R. P. BLAND, OF MISSOURI; AND REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DALZELL, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

SENATOR STEWART:

THE inadequate supply of gold creates alarm. The increasing purchasing power of money is destruction to the debtor. Fear of universal bankruptcy or repudiation disturbs the repose of the Shylocks. Falling prices discourage enterprise.

The demonetization of silver narrowed the basis of the circulating medium of the commercial world fully one-half. The use of gold alone for final payment reduces silver to credit money, the same as paper. Demonetization of silver forces ruinous competition to obtain gold, enhances the value of the metal, and reduces the price of property and services. The leading nations of the commercial world compel payment in gold. There is not gold enough for all. Only the fittest can survive.

Austria shrinks from the contest to resume payment in gold. The recent demand that she should buy $200,000,000 of gold for the purpose in hand could not be resisted, but the attempt to carry it into effect threatened the bankruptcy of the other creditors of the gold combination. They have given Austria a respite while

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

they enforce payment from weak debtors, reduce credits, and enlarge their securities. When that is done Austria must buy over five per cent. of the gold of the world at whatever cost it may require. Nothing but determined opposition can prevent the gold combination from continuing to exact harder terms until the power of resistance is exhausted, the narrow gold basis established throughout the world, and all men made tributary to the wealth and power of the controllers of gold.

It is natural for politicians to depend upon the gods of avarice for support. They endure with fortitude injustice to the people while the instruments of that injustice are concealed. The fear of detection and the irritation which extortion creates are their only restraints. When rebellion is threatened, party leaders seek refuge in falsehood and subterfuge. The devoted and most faithful agents of the gold-trust in political life dare not confess that they are in favor of the destruction of silver as money; but they ostentatiously declare themselves bimetallists while they secretly conspire to destroy the money function of silver. Their success in deceiving the people by false promises has inspired them with contempt for the intelligence of the masses.

The device of an international monetary conference has been the most successful fraud. Of the two conferences, one was held in 1878, the other in 1881. Both secured the object designed—delay. A general election is pending in Great Britain and in the United States. The silver question is a disturbing element in both countries. Another conference is proposed. Any evidence that side-tracking the silver question is not the only result intended would be gratifying.

It would be interesting to know by what authority of law the conference will be held. Has any government to be represented signified, by proper authority, that its mints will be opened to the free coinage of silver upon any conditions whatever? Why are all the preliminary negotiations relating to the proposed conference confined within the golden circle? What questions are to be discussed? Is the United States further to be humiliated by submitting its right to coin money according to the constitution to a European conference of money-lenders?

The United States demonetized silver six months in advance of any government of continental Europe. The suggestion that the legislation of 1873 was secured by fraud does not alter the

case. The fact that the United States took the lead in that robbery is undisputed. Why should not this government lead in restoring the money function to silver?

The only question which affords an excuse for an international agreement is the ratio. A common ratio between the gold and the silver coins of the commercial nations might facilitate exchanges. But why call a conference for that purpose until the countries to participate therein have decided to open their mints to the coinage of silver for depositors of bullion? When the several governments have agreed to coin silver, a common ratio for such coinage will be readily established. The interest of all concerned will require that ratio to be about 15½ of silver to 1 of gold.

The silver coin of the United States contains more silver in proportion to the gold in the gold coin than the silver coin of any other country in the world, except Mexico. Our ratio is 16 of silver to 1 of gold. The ratio in Europe is 15½ of silver to 1 of gold, and the ratio of India is about 15 of silver to 1 of gold. Europe has about $1,100,000,000 of silver coin. She would lose over 3 per cent., or something over $33,000,000, by recoining her legal-tender silver at our ratio. India has about $900,000,000 of silver coin. She would lose about 7 per cent., or about $63,000,000, by recoining it at our ratio. We have about $500,000,000 of silver coin, which, if recoined on the European ratio, would give us a gain of about 3 per cent., amounting to about $15,000,000. There is about $3,900,000,000 of silver coin in the world.

Any increase in the quantity of silver in the coinage as compared with gold would decrease the volume of silver coin. If a ratio of twenty to one should be established for the recoinage of $3,900,000,000 of silver, it would involve a loss of more than $1,000,000,000. Fifteen and one-half to one is about the natural ratio. As nearly as can be ascertained, the weight of the stock of silver of the world is about fifteen and one-half times the weight of the gold. Besides, any considerable increase in the weight of silver coin would make it too heavy and inconvenient for use. No honest bimetallist would consent to a change of the present ratio of the United States, except to adopt the European ratio of fifteen and a half to one.

Whatever international ratio might be established, the parity

of the two metals would be maintained at that ratio. Neither gold nor silver would then be the standard for measurement of value, but the dollar, the franc, or the pound, would be the unit of account and the standard. The fact that the money unit was manufactured of gold or of silver would make no difference. The material required to make a dollar, whether it were silver or gold, would have the same commercial value, and that is why the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver has always maintained the parity in value of the two metals at the ratio established by law.

I do not desire to impugn the motives of the administration in its efforts for a monetary conference. I hope it is not playing into the hands of the gold combination. But secrecy is not a badge of honesty. The character of the delegates will furnish much light. Any man who argues that silver is a burden to be unloaded on some other country, and not a blessing to be coined into money in this country, is an enemy of free coinage. The appointment of such a man will be evidence of bad faith.

WM. M. STEWART.

REPRESENTATIVE SPRINGER:

THE silver question will not down. The House of Representatives at Washington spent weeks in its discussion, and the Senate has taken it up, to the exclusion of the tariff and all other subjects. The President has called an international conference to secure, if possible, an international agreement in reference to silver coinage.

The only international agreement in reference to gold and silver coins which has been entered into heretofore, is known as the Latin Union. It took effect August 1, 1866. The nations which entered into this union at that time were France, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland; but Greece and Roumania entered the association in April, 1867. This union was for the purpose of regulating "the weight, title, form and circulation of their gold and silver coins." The ratio of full legal tender of silver and gold was fixed at one of gold to fifteen and a half of silver.

The contracting governments bound themselves not to coin, or permit to be coined, any gold or silver pieces other than those provided for in the treaty. The gold coins were pieces containing 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 francs, and the silver coins were to be

of the denomination of one, two and five francs, and of twenty and fifty centimes. The silver coins were to be of full legal-tender to the amount of fifty francs between individuals of the State in which they were issued, but the nation issuing them was to receive them to any amount. It was agreed that the amount of silver coins of the one and two-franc pieces and the twenty and fifty-centime pieces should be limited to an amount not exceeding six francs to each inhabitant. Coins already in circulation were to be maintained in proportions fixed in the treaty.

This treaty of 1865 was to remain in force until January 1, 1880. If not repealed it was to continue in force for an additional fifteen years, and so on until repealed.

A supplementary treaty was entered into by the same nations in 1874, by which the coinage of five-franc pieces was limited for that year in each government to a given amount, and a similar limitation was made for 1875 and 1876; and in 1877 the coinage of five-franc pieces was suspended except as to Italy. In 1878 the same nations renewed their monetary treaty. The governments of Spain, Holland, Russia, and the Central and South American States, have established the same ratio between gold and silver—that of 1 to 15½.

In Great Britain the ratio of limited coinage is that of 1 to 14.28, in Germany the ratio is that of 1 to 13.957. In Mexico the full legal-tender ratio of the coinage is that of 1 to 16½. In the United States the ratio is that of 1 to 16. In Japan it is 1 to 16.16; in India it is 1 to 15.

The ratio between gold and silver adopted by the various nations differs so little that a uniform ratio could be established with but little inconvenience. Now that the ratio of the Latin Union has been adopted by so many of the leading nations of the earth, it is not unreasonable to insist that that ratio should be accepted by other nations.

An international agreement fixing this ratio, if adopted by the United States, England, Germany and Mexico, in addition to the nations which have already adopted it, would secure in a very short time a universal acquiescence in this ratio. In that event the United States could recoin all its silver pieces and make a profit by the operation. On every 15½ ounces of silver in the new coins the government would receive a bonus of one-half ounce. Our dollar would then be equal to five francs of the Latin Union.

A limited agreement of this kind would greatly facilitate commercial transactions, and simplify and unify the coinage of all nations entering into the agreement. If a limited agreement of this kind could be made and put into practical operation, there is every reason to believe that more liberal provisions looking to a larger use of silver could be secured in the future. In the course of time free and unlimited coinage would, in all probability, be adopted by the leading commercial nations. Those who desire to accomplish free coinage must realize that complete success cannot be expected immediately. There is so much prejudice or misapprehension on the subject that international agreements establishing fixed ratios and uniform and unlimited coinage will be entered upon, if at all, with great hesitation. This fact, however, should not deter those who desire the utilization of both metals to the greatest extent possible from favoring every effort to bring about international monetary conferences. If complete success is not at first accomplished, partial success may be ; and partial success, to the extent of securing the provisions of the Latin Union for all great commercial nations, is attainable and may be secured at the first conference which may be held.

It is evident that, unless earnest effort is made, no agreement can be secured ; and, as an advocate of bimetallism, I favor every reasonable effort that can be put forth, which looks to the greater utilization of both metals. I favor especially an international monetary congress, to be held in the United States at the earliest time practicable ; and any and all conferences whose object it may be to secure the coöperation of the great commercial nations in this matter.

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER.

SENATOR HANSBROUGH:

WHEN the civilized nations of the world shall have been placed upon an equality with each other as to a monetary medium, the political patents now running upon the use of such expressions as "gold bugs" and "silver kings" will have expired, and bimetallism will prevail.

What is needed, in my opinion, is an established relationship between gold and silver—say 16 to 1 in all the gold-union nations, with the positive understanding that such relationship is not to be disturbed except by the unanimous consent of the interested

powers. An international monetary agreement is the only means by which this result can be reached.

For fifty years, at least, there has been a strong tendency towards what may be termed a universal currency. The effects of the operations of the old colonial and subsequent State-banking systems may be cited in confirmation of this proposition. In colonial times the paper-currency pound sterling in Virginia, Kentucky, Alabama, and Florida, was worth $3.33, while New York currency was worth but $2.50. In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland the value of the paper pound was $2.70, while in the current issues of the "realms" of Georgia and South Carolina it was worth $4.20. The inequality in subsidiary currency was proportionately great. Then came the State-banking system, with its "wild-cat" issues, and the ludicrous attempts of a dozen State legislatures to deal with the currency question, each after its own original plan.

The commercial bonds are much closer between the civilized nations of the earth at the present time than they were between the States of the Union a hundred years ago, and therefore the argument in favor of an international money with a uniform ratio is much stronger. The superiority of national management of the finances over State management has long been recognized and admitted. The efficacy of international management must be apparent to all.

Statute laws in one country fixing the value of a money metal that circulates and has a different coinage value in another must result in financial and commercial confusion to both. The commercial disasters and business uncertainties so prevalent in the United States during the days of independent State-bank money issues may be taken as a fair example of what may be expected if the great nations of the earth continue to pursue independent policies with respect to the ratio and fineness of their respective metallic moneys or to the use of the product of their respective mines.

It was not so much the fear that silver would become dangerously cheap, owing to the increased production, the discovery of new mines and the improved methods of mining and smelting, that caused the European nations to begin the hoarding of gold by adopting the gold standard and closing their mints to the white metal, as it was their apprehension that the United States was about to adopt the silver standard on its own account. This fact

is fairly illustrated in recent trade statistics. For the nine months ending March 31, 1892, the balance of trade in merchandise was $209,373,803 in our favor. Logically, $209,373,803 in money should have come back to us from the purchasing nations, but as a matter of fact we received but $16,253,765 in actual money. The difference of $193,120,038 consisted chiefly of American securities which the foreigner preferred to part with rather than give up his gold, which he believes will go to a premium should the United States venture, alone, upon free coinage of silver. That he would also ship his silver to this country is proven by the fact that while the silver bullion act of 1890 (the present law) was under discussion and in process of enactment by the Fifty-first Congress our imports of silver were greater than our exports by $8,000,000.

It is contended by the advocates of a free silver coinage law for the United States alone that "the people want more money," *i. e.*, a greater per capita circulation. There is some truth in this seductive and "catching" argument. If the per capita circulation of the world should be increased—and it will be increased when the gold-union nations adopt bimetallism, which they eventually must do—the people *would* have more money. On the other hand, should the United States, by act of Congress, obligate itself to pay $1.29 per ounce for silver, which is now worth but 90 cents per ounce in the markets of the world, our per capita circulation, while it would be increased to a slight extent by reason of the free coinage of silver, would be decreased by the exact amount of gold that must inevitably take itself abroad to do service among the nations now operating upon the gold standard. In the face of the fact that during the past two and a half years we have exported $320,000,000 of merchandise in excess of the amount imported and should therefore have received that amount of money from our foreign customers, we have also exported $75,000,000 of gold in excess of our gold imports; in all $395,000,000 in wealth sent abroad in the regular course of trade, for which there is no return—an amount equal to about $6 per capita of our population, which is quite as much as would have been added to our money circulation had we purchased and coined, at $1.29 per ounce, the entire world's output of silver for the same period. This per capita circulation question will admit of considerable investigation. It is one thing to make money and another to keep it.

Gold and silver have been the money mediums of the people for thousands of years; so will they ever remain. They cannot and should not be retired,—neither of them. International regulation is the true remedy. The present financial evils are not peculiar to any particular nation; they exist in all. There is sufficient gold and silver in the world to furnish the basis of a healthy international money circulation. The necessity for inflation does not exist.

It seems to be the settled policy of this country at this time, and of other countries as well, that there shall be an international conference to consider the money question, not from the narrow standpoint of sectional or community interests, but upon the broader plane of international benefit, which will be lasting in its effects. The object to be attained is to secure an agreement in favor of bimetallism in all the countries represented; no other conclusion can be reached. International free coinage of both gold and silver is the end in view; nothing less will be accepted as a final settlement of the question. A failure on the part of the Conference to recommend this as the common policy, or the failure of the conferring powers to recognize such recommendation by prompt and appropriate legislation, would simply relegate the whole question back to individual governments to be dealt with as a matter of local concern; and the result, especially in the United States, is easily foretold. Unlimited free coinage of silver, with such ratio or other regulations as the extremists might determine upon, would be authorized by law. One enthusiastic free-coinage advocate has said that the ratio should be 10 to 1; it has not been below 14.14 to 1 in two hundred years.

I have no doubt that the President will appoint as representatives of the United States in the forthcoming Conference gentlemen of distinguished ability and conservative judgment. There is no reason why the representatives of other nations taking part in the Conference should not be equally distinguished and conservative, and as all shades of opinion on financial questions are likely to be represented there is every probability that a satisfactory solution will be reached.

H. C. HANSBROUGH.

REPRESENTATIVE BLAND:

WHERE the double or bimetallic standard exists or is contemplated, the question of the ratio is of vital importance.

There is no disagreement upon the proposition that this ratio shall have reference to the relative commercial or exchange value of the two metals. The commercial or exchange value being controlled by the laws of different nations, the ratio established by the various governments where gold and silver are coined at a fixed ratio must be considered as the ultimate controlling factor in agreeing upon the ratio. Measures to the end of reaching this ratio enter at this time largely into the discussion. Informed readers need not be reminded of the fact that, for nearly one hundred years, the commercial or exchange value of gold and silver was at about the ratio of 1 of gold to 15½ of silver, or that the ratio adopted by France in 1803 was one pound of gold to fifteen and one-half pounds of silver the world over. So long as France maintained an open mint for the free coinage and exchange of these two metals at the ratio of 15½ to 1, this ratio was the absolute regulator of the exchange value of the two metals till in 1875, for reasons well known and to be hereinafter referred to, France suspended the free coinage of silver.

This country and Germany having previously, in 1873, suspended the coinage of silver, there were no longer any open mints of any great metallic power to take the place of France in the free exchange of gold and silver at a fixed ratio. England has been upon the single gold standard since 1816. A very brief historical review of our own currency laws and of those of the other nations named is essential to a fair and intelligent understanding of this matter.

One hundred years ago this country, by the act of April 2, 1792, adopted the double or bimetallic standard. Section 9 of this act provided for the dollar as follows: "Dollars or units each to be of the value of the Spanish milled dollar as the same is now current, and to contain 371$\frac{4}{16}$ grains of pure or 416 grains of standard silver." This is the dollar we now coin, the pure silver of which has never been changed. The changing of the alloy accounts for our dollar of 412½ grains of standard silver. This Spanish milled dollar had been current in the colonies, and was still our principal coin when the first mint act was passed.

On a test of these coins current it was found that they contained on the average about 371¼ grains of pure silver; hence this was fixed upon as the most equitable standard.

The silver dollar being established for the unit of value, the gold coins were to conform to the silver unit at the ratio of 15 to

1 as provided in Sec. 11 of the act as follows: "That the proportional value of gold to silver in all coins which, by law, shall be current as money in the United States, shall be as 15 to 1, according to quantity in weight of pure gold and pure silver. That is to say, every 15 pounds weight of pure silver shall be of equal value, in all payments, with one pound weight of pure gold, and so in proportion as to any greater or less quantities of the respective metals."

Eleven years later France decreed the bimetallic standard at the ratio of 15½ to 1, thus giving to gold a value relative to silver greater than our ratio. France at that time being a greater nation commercially than ours, and her mints being contiguous to the nations of the old world, she was enabled to fix the value of the two metals at her ratio, and the facts of history show beyond dispute that the two metals remained practically at this ratio the world over so long as France continued the free coinage of both metals, or until 1875, when she discontinued the free coinage of silver, as before stated. During this period Germany had changed from the single gold standard to the silver standard, and again from the single silver standard to the gold standard. Alarmed at the demonetization of silver in this country and in Germany in 1873, France broke the bimetallic par by discontinuing the free coinage of silver. Had France continued the unlimited coinage of silver, there is no question or doubt that silver and gold the world over would be interchangeable to-day at the ratio of 15½ to 1.

It is then clear that our government is primarily responsible for the present silver situation. We took the lead in the demonetization of the metal and must take the lead in its restoration. By the laws of 1834 and 1837 our ratio was changed from 15 to 1 to 15 98-100ths, or 16 to 1; it was really the amount of gold in the dollar that was changed and not the silver in the silver dollar, thus giving a higher value to gold at our mints than the French 15½ to 1. It is said this was done for the purpose of attracting gold hither to aid in supplanting the national bank-note; gold being more convenient for payment in large transactions than silver, it would more readily take the place of bank-notes. Had our statesmen at that time hit upon our present device of gold and silver notes, bank paper could have been displaced by the silver certificates as is now being done by us. The fact, how-

ever, that we changed our ratio in 1834 and 1837, and the further fact that Germany changed from the gold to the silver standard in 1857, made no perceptible impression upon the effects of the French bimetallic law.

The two metals still retained their relative commercial value at about 15½ to 1, thus conclusively proving that so long as one of the great metallic powers of the world kept open mints for the coinage of both metals at a ratio approximating the relative amount of the two metals per weight existing as money in the world, an open mint for the coinage and exchange of the two metals at such rates was all-powerful as a regulator of the relative value of these two money metals. In the light of this historical fact, why deny that the United States, the greatest nation in the world, the greatest metallic power in the world, may by her open mints successfully take the place of France in monetary history, and by open mints become the practical regulator of the relative value of these two money metals? In reality we are a republic consisting of forty-four sovereign States, with territory sufficient for four or five more independent States, with a population of sixty-five million people, and increasing at the rate of over one million annually, with the probability of reaching nearly one hundred millions of people before the boy now born can legally cast his first ballot.

We have a territory of three million square miles. The single State of Texas is larger in area than the whole of France. The intelligence of the people and the vast resources and productive power of the country have no parallel in history. All things considered, we are greater in resources and progressive development than France, England and Germany combined. Our pressing monetary needs demand a volume of money that cannot be compared to these over-developed countries of the old world.

Standing among the nations of the world as a giant among pygmies, why should we ask the aid or advice of baby England, baby Germany, or lilliputian France, in establishing for ourselves a bimetallic system based upon the ratio, or nearly upon the ratio, at which France successfully maintained the bimetallic par for over seventy years and up to the day of her hasty action of discontinuing free coinage of silver.

In adopting a ratio for ourselves, or by concurrent action of other nations, the ratio of 15½, or our own ratio of 16, should be

selected. First, Because it is the ratio, or it approaches the ratio, that has existed in the commercial world for centuries, and at which the coined gold and coined silver of the nations circulate at par in the countries where coined. Secondly, This is about the average ratio at which the nations of the world coin gold and silver into legal-tender money. Thirdly, It is near the relative amount in weight of the existing coined stock of the two metals.

The director of the mint gives the amount of gold money in the world at $3,711,845,000, of silver at $3,939,578,000. Of this amount in silver he estimates $544,166,000 to be subsidiary or limited tender. This estimate is made upon the nominal value of the silver coins at the ratio or coining value of silver in the different countries where the stocks of silver money exist. Hence the average of full legal-tender for silver would be about 15½ in weight of silver to 1 of gold. The limited-tender or fractional silver would be about 14 of silver to 1 of gold, so that it is apparent that the amount of silver money in the world is about 15½ times as great for weight of metals as that of gold. If we take the product of gold from 1873 to 1891 as shown by the director of the mint last winter in hearings before our Coinage Committee of the House of Representatives, we find the product of gold in fine ounces to be about 98,606,925, and that of silver to be 1,512,174,000 in fine ounces. This shows a ratio of production per weight in fine ounces of about 15½ of silver to 1 of gold. The facts above show that of the gold and silver money throughout the world the ratio per weight of metal is about 15½ to 1. The product from 1873 to the present time is about 15½ ounces of silver to 1 of gold—so that 15½ seems to be near the natural ratio.

The fact that for the last four or five years the annual product of silver at this ratio has been greater than the product of gold does not militate against the argument. A series of years should be taken. The mines may in a short time show a greater product of gold than of silver. Even the occurrence of a disproportional product of one or the other of these metals for a series of years, as, for instance, of gold in excess of silver during the large output of California and Australia, fails to disturb the par of 15½. The annual product constitutes too small a per cent. of the vast stock of the metals on hand to cause any perceptible fluctuations in values.

The equity of contracts the world over demands 15½ or 16 as

the ratio, since the coined silver money of the world rests at about these rates, and debts of the world were and are contracted to be paid on this basis: it would be a robbery of debtors to demand more silver in the dollar. It would be unjust to debtors as well as to the welfare of future generations to limit the monetary functions of silver by increasing the amount of silver in the dollar.

To first demonetize silver for the purpose of precipitating a rise in gold as compared with silver, and to seize upon this flagrant wrong as an excuse for readjusting the ratio in the interest of the money-lenders of the present and the Shylocks of the future ought not to be tolerated.

The late Secretary Windom, on page 73 of his report for 1887, well remarks in this connection: "The paramount objection to this plan, however, is that it would have a decided tendency to prevent any rise in the value of silver. Seizing it at its present low price, the law would in effect declare that it must remain there forever, so far as its uses for coinage are concerned."

R. P. BLAND.

REPRESENTATIVE DALZELL:

IF THE leading monetary powers of the world shall enter into an agreement for the coining of both silver and gold without restriction, and for making them severally, or jointly, full legal-tender for the payment of all debts, the practical business question is, what shall be the ratio?

The question of the relations of the precious metals to each other and to commerce is recognized as a difficult one, about which it is wise not to hazard any too positive opinion.

The question as to an international ratio is very different from the question as to a ratio for the establishment of bimetallism in one country alone. In the determination of the latter question, the existing gold price of silver would be a material factor, while in the determination of the former it is not of so much importance.

Prior to 1873 the commercial ratio of silver to gold maintained a remarkable uniformity. Up to that year from the beginning of the Christian era the points of variance were at the one extreme 14.40 of silver to 1 of gold, and at the other 16.25 of silver to 1 of gold. From the time when France, in 1803, began the free coinage of gold and silver at a ratio of 15½ to 1,

until 1873, when silver was demonetized by Germany, and its coinage restricted by the Latin Union, the relative value of gold and silver in use in Europe did not vary appreciably from the ratio fixed by French law.

In the United States the legal ratio was fixed at first at 15 to 1, and subsequently at 16 to 1. But in 1873 a change ensued. Between that date and the present the relative commercial value of silver to gold has varied from 15.92 to 1 in the former year to 20.92 to 1 in 1891.

"The great underlying cause of the decline in the price of silver," says Mr. Leech, Director of the Mint, "has been very accurately and concisely summed up in the report of the Royal Commission on Gold and Silver, 1888:

> "The action of the Latin Union in 1873 broke the link between silver and gold which had kept the former, as measured by the latter, constant at about the legal ratio; and when this link was broken, the silver market was open to the influences of all the factors which go to effect the price of *a commodity*. These factors happen, since 1873, to have operated in the direction of a fall in the gold price of that metal."

It would appear, then, that the practical fixity of the relative value of gold and silver at a ratio of 15½ to 1 from 1803 to 1873 was due principally to legislation, and that the separation of the metals thereafter in relative value was likewise due in largest part to legislation. The proposition that an international agreement shall be made to reëstablish bimetallism is a practical concession to that effect, since its purpose is to restore, if possible, the "broken link."

The link that bound gold and silver together as money was a law (or an agreement equivalent thereto) that the coinage of both should be free at a fixed ratio of 15½ to 1. The action that broke that link, and destroyed that heretofore existing monetary equilibrium between the metals, was the repeal in practice of the operation of that law. Would not a re-enactment of the law in its entirety by international agreement restore the link and with it the old-time monetary situation? In other words, is not either the French or the American ratio—a ratio heretofore proven practicable of maintenance by experience—the true one to be returned to?

If it be assumed that the relative value of the two metals depends more than anything else on their value for the purposes of money as fixed by law it would seem that the strongest argu-

ment exists for the adoption of one or other of these ratios. All the world's experience has demonstrated that the true ratio lies somewhere in the neighborhood of the French or the American, and between them there is not any fundamental difference. If the choice be limited to these two the French ratio would seem to be preferable.

The demonetization of silver did not take from the world's circulation the silver coinage. Silver has been coined since and at the same ratio. It is estimated that there are, in round numbers, $1,000,000,000 of European silver in use as money at the ratio of 15½ to 1. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows our stock of silver to have been on Nov. 1, 1891, $539,241,624, coined or to be coined at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Now, bimetallism is a desideratum because of the growing need of money in the world's constantly increasing commerce. Any change in the ratio towards cheapening the gold price of silver must result in contraction of the world's currency and defeat to that extent the object sought to be obtained by an international conference. The adoption of the ratio of 16 to 1, instead of 15½ to 1 for instance, would make a difference of 3 per cent. in the aggregate of European silver ; that is to say, the European stock when recoined, as it would have to be, would lose from its aggregate currency value $33,000,000, and there would be the cost of recoinage in addition.

The adoption of the ratio of 15½ to 1, on the other hand, would be, *ipso facto*, a remonetization of the entire European stock of silver. True, the adoption of this ratio would necessitate the recoinage of the American stock, but the margin between its legal ratio 16 to 1, and the French ratio 15½ to 1, amounting to 3 per cent., would suffice to pay the cost of recoinage.

As the United States are the largest silver producers in the world, it goes without saying that the French ratio would suit their material interests better than the ratio now in use by themselves. The objections that could be urged to any particular ratio that may be suggested may be conceded to be numerous; in other words, bimetallism can only be established internationally in the face of opposition and by mutual concessions on the part of its friends; but it is to be hoped that such concessions may be made and that the cause may triumph at whatever figure the ratio may be fixed.

JOHN DALZELL.

LYNCH LAW IN THE SOUTH.

BY THE HON. FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

THE frequent and increasing resort to lynch law in our Southern States, in dealing with alleged offences by negroes, marked as it is by features of cruelty which might well shock the sensibility of the most benighted savage, will not fail to attract the attention and animadversion of visitors to the World's Columbian Exposition.

Think of an American woman, in this year of grace 1892, mingling with a howling mob, and with her own hand applying the torch to the fagots around the body of a negro condemned to death without a trial, and without judge or jury, as was done only a few weeks ago in the so-called civilized State of Arkansas.

When all lawful remedies for the prevention of crime have been employed and have failed ; when criminals administer the law in the interest of crime ; when the government has become a foul and damning conspiracy against the welfare of society ; when men guilty of the most infamous crimes are permitted to escape with impunity ; when there is no longer any reasonable ground upon which to base a hope of reformation, there is at least an apology for the application of lynch law ; but, even in this extremity, it must be regarded as an effort to neutralize one poison by the employment of another. Certain it is that in no tolerable condition of society can lynch law be excused or defended. Its presence is either an evidence of governmental depravity, or of a demoralized state of society. It is generally in the hands of the worst class of men in the community, and is enacted under the most degrading and blinding influences. To break down the doors of jails, wrench off the iron bars of the cells, and in the dark hours of midnight drag out alleged criminals, and to shoot, hang, or burn them to death, requires preparation imparted by copious

draughts of whiskey, which leave the actors without inclination or ability to judge of the guilt or innocence of the victims of their wrath.

The consensus of opinion in the early days of California permitted a vigilance committee, composed of respectable men, to hang a lot of thieves, thugs, gamblers and cut-throats ; but it may now be fairly doubted whether even this example has not been an injury rather than a benefit to society, since it has been made the excuse for other uprisings of the people where there was no such justification as existed in California. But, granting that there may be instances where a sudden and spontaneous uprising of the populace may properly set aside the ordinary processes of the law for the punishment of crime and the preservation of society, it must still be admitted that there is, in the nature of the act itself, the essence of a crime more far-reaching, dangerous, and deadly than the crime it is intended to punish. Lynch law violates all of those merciful maxims of law and order which experience has shown to be wise and necessary for the protection of liberty, the security of the citizen, and the maintenance of justice for the whole people. It violates the principle which requires, for the conviction of crime, that a man shall be confronted in open court by his accusers. It violates the principle that it is better that ten guilty men shall escape than that one innocent man shall be punished. It violates the rule that presumes innocence until guilt is proven. It compels the accused to prove his innocence and denies him a reasonable doubt in his favor. It simply constitutes itself not a court of trial, but a court of execution. It comes to its work in a storm of passion and thirsting for human blood, ready to shoot, stab, or burn its victim, who is denied a word of entreaty or explanation. Like the gods of the heathen these mobs have eyes, but see not, ears, but hear not, and they rush to their work of death as pitilessly as the tiger rushes upon his prey.

Some of us are old enough to remember the storm of displeasure that came up from all the regions of slavery against William H. Seward for the utterance of an idea of a higher law than the law of slavery. Then the South stood up stoutly for the authority and binding force of the regularly-enacted laws, including even the infamous Fugitive Slave Law. It took to itself credit for being the conservative element in our govern-

ment, but to-day it is the bold defender of the usurpations of the mob, and its territory, in many parts, has become the theatre of lawless violence against a defenceless people. In the arguments in its defence, however, there is quite observable a slight degree of respect for the opinion of mankind and a disposition to conciliate that opinion. The crime which these usurpers of courts, laws, and juries, profess to punish is the most revolting and shocking of any this side of murder. This they know is their best excuse, and it appeals at once and promptly to a prejudice which prevails at the North as well as the South. Hence we have for any act of lawless violence the same excuse, an outrage by a negro upon some white woman. It is a notable fact, also, that it is not with them the immorality or the enormity of the crime itself that arouses popular wrath, but the emphasis is put upon the race and color of the parties to it. Here, and not there, is the ground of indignation and abhorrenee. The appeal is not to the moral sense, but to the well-known hatred of one class towards another. It is an appeal that not only stops the ears and darkens the minds of Southern men, but it palliates the crime of lawless violence in the eyes of Northern men. The device is used with skill and effect, and the question of guilt or innocence becomes unimportant in the fierce tumult of popular passion.

For two hundred years or more, white men have in the South committed this offence against black women, and the fact has excited little attention, even at the North, except among abolitionists; which circumstance demonstrates that the horror now excited is not for the crime itself, but that it is based upon the reversal of colors in the participants. Yet this apology, rightly considered, utterly fails to palliate the crime of lynch law. For if the charge against the negro is true, with the evidence of his guilt overwhelming, as is usually asserted, there could be no rational doubt of his certain punishment by the ordinary processes of the law. Thus the very argument in defence of the mob proves the criminality of the mob. If in any case there could be shown an element of doubt of the certain lawful conviction and punishment of the accused, there might be admitted some excuse for this lawless method of administering justice. But for no such doubt is there any contention. No decent white man in the South will pretend that in that region there could be impannelled a jury, black,

white, or mixed, which would in case of proof of the deed allow a guilty negro to escape condign punishment.

Whatever may be said of their weakness when required to hold a white man or a rich man, the meshes of the law are certainly always strong enough to hold and punish a poor man or a negro. In this case there is neither color to blind, money to corrupt, nor powerful friends to influence court or jury against the claims of justice. All the presumptions of law and society are against the negro. In the days of slavery he was presumed to be a slave, even if free, and his word was never taken against that of a white man. To be accused was to be condemned, and the same spirit prevails to-day. This state of opinion at the South not only assures by law the punishment of black men, but enables white men to escape punishment by assuming the color of the negro in order to commit crime. It is often asserted that all negroes look alike, and it is only necessary to bring one of the class into the presence of an accuser to have him at once identified as the criminal.

In apologizing for lynch law, Bishop Fitzgerald, of the Methodist Church South, says that the crime alleged against the negro makes him an outlaw, and he goes on to complain of the North that it does not more fully sympathize with the South in its efforts to protect the purity of Southern women. The answer to the first proposition of the learned and pious Bishop is that no man is an outlaw unless declared to be such by some competent authority. It is not left to a lawless mob to determine whether a man is inside or outside the protection of the law. It is not for a dozen men or for a hundred men, constituting themselves a mob, to say whether or not Bishop Fitzgerald is an outlaw. We have courts, juries and governors to determine that question, and it is a shame to the South that it holds in its bosom a Bishop of the Church of Christ who could thus apologize for the subversion of all law. As to the sympathy of the North, there never was a time when it was more fully with the Southern people than now.

The distressing circumstances in this revival of lynch law in different parts of the South is, that it shows that prejudice and hatred have increased in bitterness with the increasing interval between the time of slavery and now. I have been frequently asked to explain this phase of our national problem. I explain it on

the same principle by which resistance to the course of a ship is create d and increased in proportion to her speed. The resistance met by the negro is to me evidence that he is making progress. The Jew is hated in Russia, because he is thrifty. The Chinaman is hated in California because he is industrious and successful. The negro meets no resistance when on a downward course. It is only when he rises in wealth, intelligence, and manly character that he brings upon himself the heavy hand of persecution. The men lynched at Memphis were murdered because they were prosperous. They were doing a business which a white firm desired to do,—hence the mob and hence the murder. When the negro is degraded and ignorant he conforms to a popular standard of what a negro should be. When he shakes off his rags and wretchedness and presumes to be a man, and a man among men, he contradicts this popular standard and becomes an offence to his surroundings. He can, at the South, ride in a first-class car as a servant, as an appendage to a white man, but is not allowed to ride in his quality of manhood alone. So extreme is the bitterness of this prejudice that several States have passed laws making it a crime for a conductor to allow a colored man, however respectable, to ride in the same car with white men unless in the manner above stated.

To the question, What is to be the solution of this race hatred and persecution ? I have two answers, one of hope and one of fear. There may come at the South satiety even in the appetite for blood. When a wall is raised to a height inconsistent with the law of gravitation, it will fall. The South is not all a wilderness. There are good men and good women there who will sooner or later make themselves heard and felt. No people can long endure the shame and disgrace of lynch law. The South, which has been compelled to keep step with the music of the Union, will also be compelled to keep step with the music of the nineteenth century, which is preëminently a century of enlightenment and progress. The grand moral forces of this century no barbarism can withstand. They met serfdom in Russia, and it fell before them. They will meet our barbarism against color, and *it* will fall before them. I am the more encouraged in this belief because, in various parts of the North, and especially in the State of Massachusetts, where fifty years ago there existed the same proscription which at the present time prevails in the South, all men

are now treated as equals before the law and are accorded the same civil rights.

I, however, freely confess that the present prospect has for me a gloomy side. When men sow the wind it is rational to expect that they will reap the whirlwind. It is evident to my mind that the negro will not always rest a passive subject to the violence and bloodshed by which he is now pursued. If neither law nor public sentiment shall come to his relief, he will devise methods of his own. It should be remembered that the negro is a man, and that in point of intelligence he is not what he was a hundred years ago. Whatever may be said of his failure to acquire wealth, it cannot be denied that he has made decided progress in the acquisition of knowledge; and he is a poor student of the natural history of civilization who does not see that the mental energies of this race, newly awakened and set in motion, must continue to advance. Character, with its moral influence; knowledge, with its power; and wealth, with its respectability, are possible to it as well as to other races of men. In arguing upon what will be the action of the negro in case he continues to be the victim of lynch law I accept the statement often made in his disparagement, that he is an imitative being; that he will do what he sees other men do. He has already shown this facility, and he illustrates it all the way from the prize ring to the pulpit; from the plow to the professor's chair. The voice of nature, not less than the Book of books, teaches us that oppression can make even a wise man mad, and in such case the responsibility for madness will not rest upon the man but upon the oppression to which he is subjected.

How can the South hope to teach the negro the sacredness of human life while it cheapens it and profanes it by the atrocities of mob law? The stream cannot rise higher than its source. The morality of the negro will reach no higher point than the morality and religion that surround him. He reads of what is being done in the world in resentment of oppression and needs no teacher to make him understand what he reads. In warning the South that it may place too much reliance upon the cowardice of the negro, I am not advocating violence by the negro, but pointing out the dangerous tendency of his constant persecution. The negro was not a coward at Bunker Hill; he was not a coward in Haïti; he was not a coward in the late war for the Union; he

was not a coward at Harper's Ferry, with John Brown ; and care should be taken against goading him to acts of desperation by continuing to punish him for heinous crimes of which he is not legally convicted.

I do not deny that the negro may, in some instances, be guilty of the peculiar crime so often imputed to him. There are bad men among them, as there are bad men among all other varieties of the human family, but I contend that there is a good reason to question these lynch-law reports on this point. The crime imputed to the negro is one most easily imputed and most difficult to disprove, and yet it is one that the negro is least likely to commit. It is a crime for the commission of which opportunity is required, and no more convenient one was ever offered to any class of persons than was possessed by the negroes of the South during the War of the Rebellion.

There were then left in their custody and in their power the wives and the daughters, the mothers and the sisters of the rebels, and during all that period no instance can be cited of an outrage committed by a negro upon the person of any white woman. The crime is a new one for the negro, so new that a doubt may be reasonably entertained that he has learned it to any such extent as his accusers would have us believe. A nation is not born in a day. It is said that the leopard cannot change his spots nor the Ethiopian his skin, and it may be as truly said that the character of a people, established by long years of consistent life and testimony, cannot be very suddenly reversed. It is improbable that this peaceful and inoffensive class has suddenly and all at once become changed into a class of the most daring and repulsive criminals.

Now, where rests the responsibility for the lynch law prevalent in the South ? It is evident that it is not entirely with the ignorant mob. The men who break open jails and with bloody hands destroy human life are not alone responsible. These are not the men who make public sentiment. They are simply the hangmen, not the court, judge, or jury. They simply obey the public sentiment of the South, the sentiment created by wealth and respectability, by the press and the pulpit. A change in public sentiment can be easily effected by these forces whenever they shall elect to make the effort. Let the press and the

pulpit of the South unite their power against the cruelty, disgrace and shame that is settling like a mantle of fire upon these lynch-law States, and lynch law itself will soon cease to exist.

Nor is the South alone responsible for this burning shame and menace to our free institutions. Wherever contempt of race prevails, whether against African, Indian, or Mongolian, countenance and support are given to the present peculiar treatment of the negro in the South. The finger of scorn at the North is correllated to the dagger of the assassin at the South. The sin against the negro is both sectional and national, and until the voice of the North shall be heard in emphatic condemnation and withering reproach against these continued ruthless mob-law murders, it will remain equally involved with the South in this common crime.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

LADY JEUNE ON LONDON SOCIETY.

BY W. H. MALLOCK, AUTHOR OF "THE NEW REPUBLIC," "IS LIFE WORTH LIVING?" "A ROMANCE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY," ETC.

LADY JEUNE'S account of London society which appeared in this REVIEW not long ago was read by the society criticised with a great deal of attention; also it is needless to say with much difference of opinion. Some exulted in its accuracy, others were indignant at its distortion. And in a certain sense both parties were right. The justice of Lady Jeune's remarks taken separately can perhaps be denied by no one, but there are many factors in the case which she omitted altogether to consider, and thus though her details were right the effect of the whole was wrong. What, therefore, I propose to do is to supplement what she said rather than contradict it, and to alter her facts in no other way than by adding to them.

The condition of society at any given period is a subject which for many people is always full of attraction. It unites the charms of gossip with the charms of philosophy, and makes the latter fit to appear at a dinner table. To deplore the corruption of morals is often as pleasant as to add to it, and a sense of how bad our habitual companions are agreeably heightens our sense of how good we should like to be. In addition, however, to those to whom these remarks apply there are two classes of people who regard the subject in question in ways singularly different, both from this and from one another. The classes I speak of are composed of serious persons who contemplate society from a social or intellectual distance; and some of them think its condition a subject too frivolous for discussion, while it seems to others to be fraught with the fate of empires. Both views are wrong. Taken by itself the condition of society is neither. It has more significance than

is guessed by the one class, and not half the general importance that is so solemnly attributed to it by the other. I will at once explain briefly what I mean by these statements. I shall deal with them more fully a little further on.

The condition of society then, even as seen by the superficial observer, is significant as showing what men and women are under circumstances which all their contemporaries would share if they possibly could, and it is thus a brief abstract and chronicle of the tendencies and ambitions of the time; but it has not, taken by itself, the importance which certain people attribute to it, because it is not in itself the cause of its own condition. Its condition is due to causes which influence the entire community; and the effects of these, as seen in the aristocratic and fashionable world, must be studied in connection with their effects on other ranks and classes.

These wider considerations have been omitted by Lady Jeune; and her facts, for that reason, are robbed of their right significance. My purpose being to supply her omissions, I must begin by recapitulating her facts. Put briefly, they are these: Compared with what it was fifty years ago London society has become a vast and heterogeneous body. It was once composed mainly of peers and country gentlemen, most of them having long, and many of them genuine, pedigrees. At all events it was full of the exclusiveness that comes of respect for birth. But now this limited body has been broken into and swollen by a mixed multitude from the manufacturing and financial classes, together with a crowd of celebrities who are nothing if not celebrated. One result of this change has been the destruction of social comfort; but a far greater evil than the destruction of comfort is the following: The enlargement of society has made social life not so much an enjoyment as a competition; and the competition is based upon two things, of which wealth is the first and notoriety is the second, the second being largely achieved by an ostentatious use of the first. Thus smartness, fashion, distinction—the prizes of social life—are offered for sale at an auction where the bids are made in luxury. The result is that luxury becomes excessive and assumes—which is worse—an excessive importance in the mind. In itself this state of things is sufficiently corrupting. It leads to mercenary marriages, it lowers ideals and standards, it condemns women to lives of fevered idleness, in which with

the best will in the world they can hardly discover duty, and in which consequently pleasure is the only object. Women give the tone to society as they have done since the days of Eve ; and the men, though physically masculine and hardy enough, are involved by the women in a vortex of moral effeminacy.

But the evils which arise naturally from the state of affairs described have been adventitiously aggravated by the influence of certain individuals who have exaggerated them in their own lives, and, owing to their personal position, have exhibited them to the world as things to be admired and imitated. These individuals form what is called the "smart set," and, partly owing to their own strict attention to business and partly owing to the distinguished patronage they enjoy, the pursuit of pleasure as mastered and practised by themselves has come gradually to be accepted by society at large as the daily duty of fashionable and self-respecting man. In this smart set so fierce is the competition for the externals of smartness, for the superficial brilliance of life, that young and handsome wives, without any pretence of affection, willingly attach themselves to admirers for diamonds, for clothes, for horses, and even for bare money, on which last the husbands discreetly flourish, whilst fashion consecrates the transaction with a genial though tacit benediction, and the only party who is ever deceived is the lover. Of him his friends good naturedly say "Caveat emptor." These manners and morals which at present represent fashion are copied and sometimes caricatured by that numerous and opulent class whose ambition is to be fashionable. They are gradually becoming a serious danger to the country, and are undermining our social fabric "as surely and certainly as they did that of ancient Rome."

Such is the general tenor of Lady Jeune's complaint. A few of her facts may perhaps be too strongly stated, but, for argument's sake, let us take them as she puts them. Having, however, made this concession, what I desire to point out is that they are calculated, if taken by themselves, to produce an impression in many ways quite misleading.

In the first place, when talking about London society Lady Jeune omits to define what society is. An exact definition is indeed not possible, but it is easy to arrive at one that will be accurate enough for our purpose. Whatever progress democracy may have made in England the tradition of society is still aristocratic.

Its nucleus consists still of our old landed families, the most important of which enjoy high titular rank. In former days it was almost entirely composed of such persons, and even to-day it includes only such others as are in touch with them. What then is the extent of this body numerically? An answer of some sort is given in the well-known phrase the "upper ten thousand," but however approximately accurate this phrase may be if regarded as a synonym for the upper classes generally, as a synonym for the society in London it is immensely beyond the mark. Let a garden party be given by the most popular and distinguished hostess, I do not say to ten thousand, but even to five thousand people, and it is certain that the faces of those unknown to fashion would bewilder and scandalize by their number the eyes of those known to it. Still perhaps we shall not be far wrong, if we say for the purpose of a general discussion like the present that London society consists of some five thousand persons. If it consists of more, what I am about to say will have still more weight.

Now, five thousand persons, though a mere handful as compared to the nation, are an immense number when considered as a single society; and it is perfectly obvious that, in a certain sense, they cannot possibly form a single society at all, but merely a loose federation of many. Let us consider a school like Eton, or a university like Oxford, communities which number only a thousand persons and two thousand. We know how absurd it would be to regard even these smaller bodies as consisting of boys and youths all intimate or even all acquainted with one another, or sharing the same pursuits, tastes, or principles. On the contrary, we know that they consist of numerous cliques, each presenting us with some different type of living—the frivolous, the serious, the hardy, the effeminate, the literary, the sporting, the religious, and the profligate. Each community, in fact, is an epitome of human nature, and reproduces under a special set of circumstances the diversities that are found under others everywhere and in all classes. The same is the case with society. It is common to speak of the high morality of the middle class, and perhaps it is the voice of its moral section that is most frequently heard, but the middle class has its profligates just as much as society has, the only difference being that their profligacy excites less notice.

Gambling is often spoken of as an aristocratic vice. If it is a

vice at all it is a democratic vice in exactly the same proportion. There are Puritan peers and profligate sons of Methodists. So, too, in every class is to be found a section of its members with the temperament, the tastes, and the talents which in society result in smartness. The most brilliant *vaurien* who ever ruined himself on the turf is merely an *edition de luxe* of Hogarth's "Idle Apprentice." It is very important that we should bear this in mind. Smartness, though it takes its most brilliant form in society, is not characteristic of society in any special sense, but exists in society because society represents human nature. The "smart set," in fact, is not a class but a clique, and it is entirely dependent not on the birth of its members, but on their character. Two sisters are grinding at a mill. One is taken by the "smart set," the other left. A "smart set," therefore, and an aristocratic class are two distinct things, and the condition of the first is no index to that of the second.

It is, however, impossible to deny that any set which is recognized as being the smartest has an influence, whether for good or for evil, over multitudes who do not belong to it. And the fact is perfectly intelligible. Smartness, whatever people may say to the contrary, requires personal qualities of by no means a common order. Mere wealth is not enough; there must be the knowledge of how to use it. A fastidious taste is desirable, a certain amount of taste is essential. Grace, beauty, *bonhomie*, wit, and humor, and the indefinable art of giving brightness to the passing moment—all these qualities go to the production of "smartness," and a set in which they are wanting could never be called "smart," no matter how exalted might be the position of its leader. Smartness, in fact, represents the perfection of superficial living, and it has a natural, one may indeed say a legitimate, influence over persons of a certain temperament in all ranks. If, then, "smartness" is for the time being allied with anything like depravity and debasing luxury, Lady Jeune is perfectly right in considering the fact deplorable.

But here comes the point on which I am anxious to insist. Whatever may be the peculiar sins of contemporary "smartness," be they great or little, they are by no means confined to the smart set or its imitators, but are due to causes which influence every rank, and which should be sought for in history rather than in fashionable memoirs.

On the most important of these causes Lady Jeune hardly touches, and that is the growth in this country of commercial wealth. At the beginning of the century two-thirds of the wealth that paid income tax was derived from land. Now, three-fourths of it is derived from commerce, And yet the landed income itself has within that period doubled. The landed income has increased by some seventy millions. The commercial income has increased by four hundred and fifty millions. Let us take a shorter period, and we shall be able to speak more in detail and present this extraordinary change more vividly to the imagination. During the thirty years that followed the opening of the first great exhibition in London—that is between 1851 and 1880—fifty new families came into being with incomes averaging ninety thousand a year; four hundred new families with incomes averaging twenty thousand a year; a thousand new families with incomes averaging seven thousand a year; fifteen hundred with incomes averaging four thousand; two thousand with incomes averaging two thousand, and seven thousand with incomes averaging fifteen hundred. We thus arrive at a total of about twelve thousand families. I have not before me the figures of the last ten years, but there is every reason to believe that the same process is continued, and this period will accordingly give us some four thousand families more. Four and a half persons are allowed on an average to a family, and thus we arrive at a body of some seventy-two thousand persons, all belonging to families who have at least fifteen hundred a year. This calculation is really far under the mark, because the vast wealth represented by railways and many other forms of investment is not included in it. But here we have a body the aggregate income of which is something like eighty millions a year—a sum equal, roughly speaking, to three times the landed income of all our peers and country gentlemen at the time of the first exhibition. This body, this nation, one may say, of wealthy familes, is entirely the creation of the past forty years. It is as new a feature in our national life as a volcanic mountain would be suddenly shooting up in Belgravia.

The parent of this body is commerce and manufacture, stimulated by scientific invention. The makers of the new wealth have been producers and multipliers of luxuries, and their families have been the principal consumers of them. Luxuries of a cer-

tain kind the aristocracy have always enjoyed and demanded ; but the modern increase of luxury is due entirely to the middle classes, and the utmost the aristocracy do is to avail themselves of the pick of it. Let us take, for instance, the one matter of hotels and travelling. Who support the monster hotels of London, with their gilded saloons, their marble staircases, and their vast cellars, or the similar establishments to be found all over the country ? Not the aristocracy, not society, though members of society may take advantage of them and give certain of them a cachet. What supports them, what has called them into existence is the new middle class.

Who, again, support the trains *de luxe* to the Riviera ? Society may patronize them, but society does not support them. It could not supply a tithe of the travellers requisite to make them pay. What supports them is the opulent middle class. If, then, the luxury of society has increased during the past fifty years—and, as some say, scandalously increased—the luxury of other classes has increased to a far greater degree. And so far is the first from being the cause of the second, that the second is the cause of the first. Luxuries multiply as the means of producing them are perfected. The means of producing them can be perfected only when there is a growing demand, and the growth of the demand is a middle-class growth essentially. If a smart house of to-day is more luxurious than a smart house fifty years ago, this is mainly because, owing to this middle class demand, there are incalculably more objects and appliances of luxury in the market. If society only, for instance, used the electric light, we may—employing an Irish figure of speech—say, confidently, that there would be no electric light to use. Electric-lighting companies are supported by the fashionable world, no doubt, but they are supported mainly by wealth, which is entirely outside fashion. And with modern luxury generally the case is just the same. For a further illustration, let us go back to travelling. Any one who would now travel luxuriously in the East can do so best by a tourist agency. Tourist agencies are now patronized by the most distinguished sections of society, but their original patrons were exclusively the middle classes, and the luxuries of Eastern travel which society now enjoys, and which have been almost forced upon it, are altogether a middle class creation, of which society has availed itself only after a long delay, and not without a period of protest.

So far then as luxury is concerned, the most luxurious smart society merely exhibits a phenomenon which is to be found everywhere, and results from causes affecting all classes similarly. Let us now turn from its luxury to its alleged moral laxity. Lady Jeune mentions three causes as combining, in addition to its luxury, to produce this,—influential example, idleness, and the decay of religious belief. Now as to one of these causes, namely influential example, it may be responsible for a good deal, but the circumstances of the society on which it operates are responsible for still more. We will therefore put this factor in the case aside, and consider merely luxury, idleness, and the decay of religious belief. Here again we shall see that society in its moral just as in its material condition exhibits the result of influences not peculiar to itself and not even originating in itself. How this holds good of luxury we have seen already ; how it holds good of idleness a moment's reflection will show us.

Idleness, as Lady Jeune says, is the vice of our women rather than of our men, and it vitiates the men principally through the women. But women in society, especially the smartest women, have countless occupations, no matter how frivolous. The women to whom actual idleness, or a difficulty in finding occupation, is principally a source of danger, are not the women pointed at in Lady Jeune's criticism. There is more idleness in the opulent classes outside than there is in society itself ; whilst as to the decline of religious belief, not only is it a fact not confined to smart society, but it is certain that the smart society neither originated it nor is responsible for it. The decline of religious belief so marked in the present century is directly due to scientific and historical discovery. It originated in the library and the study, not amongst the flowers of the ball room. And if the morals of "smart" society suffer from it, they suffer in common with the morals of a section of every class in the nation.

There is, however, this to be said : Whatever may be the result on social life of all these modern influences, though smart society may not be in itself responsible for them, yet in smart society they come, as it were, to a head ; but they do so for a reason very different from that which is popularly supposed. They do so, not from any exaggeration or corruption of the aristocratic principle, but from the growth of the democratic principle. All aristocracies, if they do not rest on war, rest on wealth,

but they differ from plutocracies in these two fundamental points—that their wealth is permanent in families and that it is associated with political power. It is to the first that they owe their refinement, to the second that they owe their character. Power means duty, or, at all events, energetic activity; whilst the respect for birth as birth, even in the wealthiest society, tempers the value of mere wealth as such by the consideration it insures for the numbers of individuals who are poor. But for an aristocracy to exist in this condition it must not only be the most powerful body in the country, it must also be the most wealthy body. And up to a comparatively recent time the landed aristocracy in England was so. It is so now no longer. A new class is arisen, generated by the vapor of the steam engine, which has first rivalled and then eclipsed it in wealth, and first rivalled and then eclipsed it in power. The new class, however, lacked one thing. It lacked the refinement, the tone, the position, which alone make wealth and power socially desirable; and these could only be got by receiving them from the hands of the aristocracy through a kind of apostolic ordination.

In England, as in all other countries, great wealth, if it has only remained long enough in a family always, ultimately, lifted its possessors into the aristocratic rank. Indeed in countries where aristocracies remain most exclusive this is merely a sign that new fortunes are not frequently made. The England of this century differs from the England of the last, not in the fact that the possession of a great fortune raises its possessor socially, but in the fact that new great fortunes are incalculably more numerous. The career of the banking family of the Childes with their stately abode at Osterley and their distinguished alliances, would satisfy the most aspiring financial family of to-day. The only difference is that where formerly there was one Childe there are now whole families of children. And the result of this difference is, no doubt, socially very great. When new families enter a society slowly they are absorbed by that society and in no way change it. But when numbers of new families are entering it at the same time, all anxious for the most intimate and eager welcome, they all try to outdo one another in displaying their recommendations, which consist in their wealth and in the luxuries their wealth can buy. They put themselves entirely at the service of the society which they wish to enter; partly in the way

of entertainments competitive in their charm or luxury, partly in the way of fortunes to be had for the matrimonial asking.

Now of all kinds of life to which great wealth is essential, that to which it is most essential is the "smart" life. It is therefore towards the "smart set" that the new wealth gravitates and in which its presence and influence is most obvious. This new wealth is so enormous and employed with so much *savoir vivre*, that its possessors not only equal in the arts of living those whom they wish to conciliate, but far outdo them; and this is now more the case than ever, when almost all landed fortunes have shrunk, and the great houses of London give large entertainments rarely. Thus new wealth—wealth independent of birth—has a power now that it did not have formerly, in that it gives a standard of living to smart society, instead of taking a standard from it; nor does this apply to material luxury merely; it applies to the fact that this new wealth, unlike landed wealth, has no recognized duties, and tends to make its possessors pleasure-seeking citizens of the world, rather than rulers and leaders of their own particular country.

But whatever the change thus wrought may be, the causes of it are to be sought in these wide movements I have indicated, far more than in the conduct and example of special individuals. Aristocracies have often been corrupted and from various causes, but if English smart society has any special moral maladies to-day those specific causes are not aristocratic but democratic, and no class is free from them.

And this brings me back to what I said at the beginning, that the public importance of the morals of a fashionable society, though great, may be easily exaggerated. Lady Jeune talks of the society of Rome being undermined by its luxury, as though it and the empire perished in some sudden catastrophe; she forgets that the luxury and the Empire of Rome both took a long time dying, if, indeed, the former be dead yet; she forgets that Theodora flourished five hundred years after Nero. The fact is, that when an aristocracy falls after it has grown corrupt and luxurious, its fall is due, not to its corruption, but to some common cause which has produced both. The French Revolution was due not to bad morals but to bad farming, not to the fact that the nobles had too much money, but that the country at large was prevented from producing enough of it. Still if the morals of

any prominent set were ever calculated to have a general influence, they are more likely to have it now than at any former time ; and here again is the result of the democratic spirit.

Such being the case, however, it is important to dwell on a fact which Lady Jeune has indeed mentioned, but to which she has hardly given sufficient prominence. "Smartness" is a word which bears different meanings outside society and in it. When the general public sees an account of a party at which all the guests were persons of the highest rank, or at least belonging to families of notorious distinction and antiquity, the general public would speak of this party as "smart;" but society itself uses the word in a far narrower sense, and the majority of persons to whom the general public would naturally apply the name would in all probability repudiate any claim to it. Few things indeed surprise Americans more than to learn, as they do learn when they study our society on the spot, how many of the wealthiest, the most illustrious, the most powerful of our old families, boasting the loftiest titles and the most renowned names, mix with the "smart set" only in the most accidental way, neither by taste, habit nor desire, in any way belonging to it.

"Smartness," as I have said before, is the result, not of birth, but of personal temperament, just as yachting is ; and we may say of the devotees of the first, as we may say of the devotees of the second, that what pleases them may make many of their relations sick. No doubt the "smart set" is surrounded by a body of devoted and unsuccessful imitators, but of all sections of society this is the least distinguished. I have said that "smartness" is the perfection of superficial living, and that it cannot exist without many fascinating qualities ; if then "smartness" be allied at the present moment, as Lady Jeune maintains, with a relaxation or depravation of morals, the wonder is, not that its influence should be so great, but that it should be so small. Lady Jeune herself admits that the section of society in which "rank, birth, and vast possessions" fill their possessors with a sense of their responsibilities, in which private life is decorous, and public duties are faithfully discharged, is larger and more important than the section in which decorum and responsibility are forgotten. Lady Jeune, I say, admits this. My only complaint is that she does not state the fact with sufficient relative emphasis. One fact, however, she does state clearly, though she does not point out its

significance. She says that this section of society "represents the power of resistance which alone can withstand the demoralizing influence of contemporary smartness." This is really saying, whether she meant to say so or no, that just as the demoralization of to-day is the result of the growth of the democratic element, so the power of resistance is to be found in the survival of the aristocratic.

That aristocracies are or have been stricter in their private morality than other classes, I do not say for a moment, nor do I say that the aristocratic element need always have the tendency ascribed to it in the present instance. Lady Jeune is dealing and I am dealing with the events and facts of one special period only. Her point is, not that society is bad, but that in certain specific ways it is worse than it was thirty or forty years ago; and just as she implies that it is the aristocratic element which resists this change, I have endeavored to point out in detail that it is the democratic element which has promoted it. And by the democratic element I mean no particular politicians or agitators, or school of politics, but those great economic movements, and those great intellectual movements which lie behind and under all these, and are affecting the lives of all countries and of all classes simultaneously.

W. H. Mallock.

THE NEEDS OF THE NEW NORTHWEST.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA.

MANY of the citizens of the country living east of the Alleghanies have but a faint conception of the growth and development that have taken place in the last quarter of a century beyond the Mississippi River. They have read startling accounts of the marvellous changes occurring in the West. Some of the stories told have been more or less exaggerated—a good many overdrawn to such an extent as to savor of absolute misrepresentation. Eastern people have loaned their money to aid in the development of the Northwest, with profit, as a rule; rarely with loss. In this manner they have gained some idea of what has taken place in this part of the world. Merchants and manufacturers, too, have sold their wares to their Western customers, and there are other interests of a commercial kind linking the two together and spreading information as to the character and scope of the growth and prosperity of this favored region.

Before suggesting the material needs of this rapidly developing community, permit me to briefly call attention to the results that have been attained within a little less than thirty years. The writer of this article came to Minnesota as a boy in 1861. At that date there was not a railroad in the State. St. Paul was a town containing about 8,000 people, and Minneapolis, possessed of a magnificent water-power, had not attained the importance of her sister city. Duluth lived in the imagination. The entire western and northern part of Minnesota, and the two States known as the Dakotas, were given over to the Indians, with here and there a white settler. The farming lands adjacent to the Mississippi and Minnesota rivers were fairly well taken up, the grain finding an outlet by water connection to railroads extending across Wisconsin and Illinois. The invasion of the pine forests of Northern Minnesota by venturesome lumbermen was beginning. All of the vast territory lying beyond the Missouri River, including the rich mineral lands of Montana, and the

timber and farming lands on the eastern side of Washington, awaited settlement.

The changes have been so rapid as to almost make us marvel at the origin of the power that wrought them. Transportation facilities now extend across the entire country. The Twin Cities number nearly 400,000 people. Duluth is one of the great primary wheat markets of the world. The farm lands of Minnesota and the two Dakotas produced something like one hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat last year. Montana is now a great silver and copper-producing State. In addition, its wide ranges offer inducements and opportunities for enlarged traffic in cattle and sheep. Idaho is rich in minerals, while Washington fairly teems with great crops of grain and wonderful forests of timber which are now coming into use.

In this age of iron—this age of the development of the forces of electricity, of steam—we are borne along with the stream, and few pause to contemplate what has occurred in so short a time in the northwesterly States lying next to the British boundary. It is marvellous. It is only when confronted with the facts that we are impressed with the almost dynamic force that has been expended to attain such wonderful results. We halt for a breathing place and ask the question, "What are the needs of the new Northwest for its continued material prosperity? Its progress has been remarkable; what of its future?"

Primarily the strength of a community lies in the character, the force, and the intelligence of its citizens. Let encouragement be given to all well-disposed, law-abiding, thrifty emigrants to come to this new country and settle here, prepared to become Americans. Keep out, by the force of legislation, every individual tainted with communism, anarchism, or the like. The continued importation of an element not in harmony with the ideas of the Republic is a source of danger to the future of the country, and should be summarily stopped. The Northwest will not be benefited by becoming a dumping-ground for the refuse population of the countries of Southern Europe. Our immigration laws need revising to protect the new States from the evils that are likely to come upon them through the indiscriminate and faulty enactments now in orce.

A community of the highest order, prosperous, intelligent and

law-abiding, cannot result from elements made up of people banished from their native lands for crime, pauperism, or general worthlessness. The men who laid the foundation for the future growth and success of this new country do not desire the work that has been accomplished in the past to be endangered in the future by the admission of the discordant portions of society whose mission is to destroy rather than build up.

Millions of arable acres await the plow. Unseen wealth, in the form of gold, silver, and iron, is lying hidden. Vast forests, as yet unknown to the axe of the pioneer, are ready to succumb to the relentless march of events. The avenues to wealth are many and varied. Let them be traversed by the man who is in accord with the citizenship of the Republic, and who loves and respects the law. Let education flourish to the greatest extent. The university, the common and the high school are essential to a full and complete system of education. The intelligence of the masses is a necessary adjunct to the permanency of free institutions. The State should provide liberally for its children in this direction as a means necessary to its own safety.

Where the ballot is absolutely free, with practically no restriction, it is requisite that every voter should be educated sufficiently to understand the meaning and the force of the privileges granted to him by reason of his citizenship. With education must necessarily follow the ability to reason and to discriminate as to what is good or bad for the community.

The Northwestern States have provided bountifully through grants of land, taxation, etc., for a broad and liberal system of education. It is a safeguard against the evils that are likely to arise from intrusting the voting franchise to the ignorant and lawless.

The opportunities for the use of new capital for the development of latent industries are almost limitless. Mines are to be opened, cities to be built up, and farms to be tilled, while manufacturing interests of many kinds are ready for the capitalist. Railroads are still needed in some localities.

It is easy enough to hold out glittering allurements to the older sections of the East to send their surplus earnings to this new country, but some assurances must be given that the capital sent will not be discriminated against by local legislation. The laws should be so framed as to deal out equal justice and protec-

tion to all. There has been an effort in some of the Northwestern States to enact legislation unfavorable to those with capital residing without the borders of the State. This idea is essentially unfair as well as entirely impolitic. The new Northwest needs the help of older and richer communities for its successful development, and it is the height of folly to build a wall of unjust legislation about this new country and thereby practically prohibit needed money from finding its way to us. Let our laws be so wrought as to bear equally and fairly upon capital, whether it be our own or that of our neighbor.

Another need of this new country is that every intelligent citizen shall interest himself in public affairs. In many localities there is a disposition upon the part of too many men of character and standing to shirk their duty and leave the administration of the public welfare to any one who is willing to look after it. The result is much that is bad and indifferent in government. This is entirely wrong; and if a standard of high citizenship is to be developed in the Northwest, coupled with a prosperous and intelligent community, every man, whatever his calling or station in life, must do his share of public duty.

I might suggest other needs, and there are many that I have not even touched upon; but the prescribed limits of this article forbid.

The Northwestern States comprise a limitless empire of future greatness. The infusion and commingling of the blood of the best of different nationalities, with the advantages of climate and locality, coupled with the natural sources of wealth so abundant, may evolve, as, indeed, they should, the finest kind of American men and women. It will be, after all, a question of utilizing these various forces. The opportunities are vast, and it will rest with the individual to say whether the best results shall be accomplished.

Let the citizens of the new Northwest see to it that laws humane and just be enacted, and that educational and civilizing influences are guarded and fostered. Let them look to it that her people, as individuals, are amply protected in their homes and in their vocations; that industries, manufactories, and corporate enterprises are heartily encouraged, yet firmly held, within those limits beyond which they become oppressive, and the future we hope for is assured to us.

WILLIAM R. MERRIAM.

POLITICS AND THE PULPIT.

I. THE DUTY OF FIGHTING CIVIL CORRUPTION.

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

"THE duties of the clergy towards their parishioners in political matters" is a large subject to be treated briefly, all the more so because the putting of the word *duties* in the plural means that it covers more points than one.

That the Kingdom of Christ is not of this world is a statement, which contains an inherent and perpetual law of that Kingdom, and lays down, I think, a characteristic feature of the Church. Like the individual Christian, the Church is to be *in* the world but not *of* it; but *in* it as leaven, salt, light, to quicken, sweeten and brighten it; and in both instances there is a danger always of the two extremes, too entire withdrawal from, and too complete mingling with, the world. It is in the golden mean between these two that all duties lie; and the mean is not the cowardly compromise of an afterthought, but the original way, which men have left, to run to one or another extreme.

Making application of this general statement to the particular instance, I must for a moment pause to define political matters. It is a noble word degraded sadly, this word *politics*. It has in it the thought of the old pride, such as that for Jerusalem, for Rome, for Athens, even for Tarsus, which has not only adorned the great cities of the world, but has made the great citizens. It goes higher even than that, as it involves St. Augustine's splendid plea for the Civitas Dei; and reminds us that the Church of God on earth is type and threshold of the golden-streeted city, the heavenly Jerusalem. Dragged in the mire of to-day by the selfishness of men and the unscrupulousness of parties, there is a high and holy element in political matters, about which the clergy have grave duties to discharge.

We are smarting to-day in the Capital City and in this great State, because of an utter confusion in the minds of men between questions which involve eternal principles of right, truth, morality, righteousness, manhood, citizenship, statesmanship, and the law of God; and the passing, changing, petty, local questions and concerns about which men may honestly differ and disagree.

I believe the first duty of the clergy to their parishioners in political matters is to teach men to draw these distinctions.

There are many reasons why the Lord's Day and the Lord's House should be kept free from the heated atmosphere of political denunciations and discussions. Both the place and the day are sanctuaries, places of refuge, of refreshment, of rest from the toil and stir of platforms and parties; and while the occasion may arise when religion should make its scourge of small cords, and utter burning words of righteous indignation against the cruelty and corruption of "wickedness in high places," there is always danger of the disastrous results that came to the Israelites who brought the Ark of God into the battlefield of the Philistines. But when political parties take up *moral* questions in *immoral* ways, it is not political preaching to denounce the immorality; and when immoralities are threatened in political action, it is the duty of the clergy, who are the guardians of morality, to warn their people of the danger.

Let two or three instances point the argument. When it is known that moral issues are at stake in an election, I think the clergy ought to warn the people that they should secure if possible the nomination of men in their own particular party who are known to hold strong and positive convictions on the right side of those questions; and if a party nominates unprincipled and unsafe men, the votes of honest Christian people should be withheld from them, no matter what the party demands may be. For in this way only can partisan leaders be taught to feel that they have no right to apply the modern thumb-screw of a caucus to the great issues and principles of righteousness and truth.

A very striking illustration is furnished by recent events in one of the Southern States. The Louisiana lottery question entered largely into the last elections there. It contained in it a mercenary element, namely, as to taxation; from which the citizens of the State were largely relieved by the *blood-money* which the

treasury of that State had no scruple in receiving. Certainly no faithful teacher could fail to press home to the consciences of his people the root-evil of this accursed sin, which lies under the very strongest token of Divine displeasure since ever the soldiers mocked the misery of the Divine Saviour, by gambling under the Cross.

Nearer home, two instances have pressed in on my mind very strongly. In the Assembly of the State of New York this year two bills were introduced, dealing with matters of vital importance ; two great principles of morality and religion—the so-called Excise Law and the miscalled "Freedom of Worship" bill. They were both introduced and dealt with as *party* measures ; the one avowedly in the interest of the liquor dealers, whom it was supposed to restrict ; and the other plainly in the interest of the Roman Catholic effort to use the State money, for the maintenance of their religious teaching. It is nothing to the point that persistent efforts removed two or three of the grosser outrages of the bill for the promotion of intemperance, and emasculated the other bill by taking out the words which authorized the State "to provide for" (which certainly meant to *pay for*) certain religious services. The bills in their worst or better estate dealt with great questions of principle. They were first defeated, and then carried, in the Assembly. How? A few politicians, desiring to secure votes for the passage of their own bills creating a water commission and changing the inspectors of a town election, bought the votes of opponents to these measures by withholding their own votes from these two bills ; and when this nefarious trade was accomplished, they turned their votes over bodily in favor of the bills which they had just before voted against ! It is not merely the imbecile inconsistency of voting two ways upon the same question within ten days ; not merely the treachery of condemning and then commending the principles which the bills involved ; but the wickedness of dealing with a question of principle and of party policy as though they were upon the same level.

Does not the duty of the clergy to their parishioners in political matters lie just here ? Because a question is made political, it does not necessarily follow that it ceases to be a question of principle ; and politics, in the modern degradation of the word—that is to say, party interests and personal advantages—must be left out when a great principle is at stake.

I think we ought to teach our people that gambling is a sin; that intemperance must be prevented, as far as possible by law, and punished; that the Lord's Day must be kept holy, at least by abstinence from work and the removal of the opportunities for sin; that freedom of worship means *not* allowing the State to provide for the support of any particular religious system. I am inclined to go further even than this, since it has been demonstrated in the State of New York at any rate, that, in order to secure their own interests, liquor dealers will elect politicians who will pander to their wishes and bow to their dictation. I am inclined to think that the clergy would be wise to begin an effort *to wipe out all excise legislation from the Statute Books;* and to keep, only in the Penal Code, enactments which would punish drunkenness and the makers of it, the violation of Sunday, and the grosser evils of the liquor trade. It pays the modern politician to keep up saloons, in order to secure the support of their frequenters, and to extort money from them for election purposes. I believe the number of saloons is due to this more than to the number of drinkers. Political saloons and saloon politics are the curse of our legislation. If it cannot be removed in any other way, let us remove liquor from politics, and politics from liquor, by ceasing to legislate on the question at all.

Deeper and farther down, because not touching questions that are merely of the day, lies the tremendous duty upon every man who is charged with the cure of souls perpetually to impress upon people,—sometimes with the voice of one who cries in the wilderness in denunciation of sin, and sometimes with the tenderer appeal that holds up the splendid standards of the Gospel and character of Christ,—the great principles of purity, righteousness, truth, manhood, and the courage of convictions, as against the cowardice of mere expediency, cost whatever the maintenance of these principles may.

WM. CROSWELL DOANE,
Bishop of Albany.

II. THE PREACHERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

BY BISHOP WILLARD F. MALLALIEU.

IT WILL help us to a correct understanding of the duties of the clergy towards their parishioners, in political matters, if we con-

sider what is properly meant by the word politics. Certainly we do not mean the dishonest, artful schemes and tricks, the frauds that are sometimes resorted to by unprincipled men to secure honor, official position, and financial emolument, either for themselves or friends. Such conduct is everywhere and always worthy of the severest condemnation. No self-respecting and God-fearing preacher will ever have anything to do with such men and methods except to hold them up to the scorn and contempt and abhorrence of all real patriots, of all good and true men.

The proper signification of the word "politics" is expressed in the following terms: It is "the science of government, that part of ethics that has to do with the regulation and government of a nation or State, the preservation of its safety, peace and prosperity; the defence of its existence and rights against foreign domination or conquest, the augmentation of its strength and resources, and the protection of its citizens in their rights, with the preservation and improvement of their morals." Politics thus defined does not differ essentially from patriotism. It is the duty of every patriot to know the principles upon which his government is founded, to know about the laws and their administration, to care for the peace and prosperity of all the people, to antagonize every enemy and every malign influence that may arise from without or within, to protect the people in the untrammelled exercise of every proper and legitimate right, and to promote in every possible way the intelligence and morality of each individual.

It is inevitable that communities, and the nation, should be divided into parties. It will happen sometimes that such parties differ only in matters of minor importance, and the greatest object that either seeks is the control of affairs for the sake of the official honors and profit. Or it may be that parties are divided on questions that are purely and only financial, and upon which the ablest and most experienced statesmen and financiers are not agreed. Or again, it may be that parties are divided in regard to the details of administration concerning the necessity of which all are agreed. In all such cases there is no exigency which requires, or ordinarily would justify, the intervention of the clergy.

But it has often happened in the history of nations that great

moral, and social, and religious questions have confronted the people. At such critical times it is not only the privilege, but it is the imperative duty of the clergy to take a decided and active part in forming public opinion and shaping the action of the people.

Such certainly was the course pursued by the priesthood and the prophets under the Mosaic economy; Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and many others condemned or approved both laws and rulers as they antagonized, or harmonized with, the plans and purposes and laws of the Almighty. Braver men than some of these old prophets never lived. The Ahabs and Jezebels and their unholy and unpatriotic practices were fearlessly condemned. Jesus, the sublime and supreme model for all preachers, denounced in severest terms the scribes and pharisees, the rulers of his people, and held their practices up to the light of day as worthy only of the scorn of all good men. Paul and Peter and John, with multitudes of their immediate successors, followed closely the example of the Master. Huss, Savanarola, Martin Luther, and John Knox were as much political agitators and revolutionists as they were religious reformers. The sound of Luther's hammer nailing his ninety-five theses upon the heavy oak door of the old church at Wittemberg has never ceased to reverberate, and it is heard to-day wherever shackles are broken and yokes are riven, and wherever the strongholds and bastiles of tyranny and slavery are thrown down by the delivered peoples. It was heard in the clash of arms that emancipated our fathers in the War of the Revolution, and heard again in the awful thunders of that vaster conflict that brought deliverance to four millions of our outraged fellow men.

Neither of these struggles would have been entered upon had it not been for the patriotic, political action of the clergy. True, not all the clergy were agreed, for in the old times there were some who were so utterly Tory in their sentiments that all their influence was on the wrong side as regards human liberty; and, in these recent times, there were also some who claimed to believe that the abominations and infamies of slavery were providential, and that the institution itself was divine and must continue to endure.

The preachers of New England made the Revolution possible. Away back as early as 1633 there was a Thursday lectureship

established in Boston by the Rev. John Cotton, which continued for more than two hundred years. It was especially designed for the discussion of social and political subjects by the clergy. It was for one hundred and fifty years most emphatically a nursery of liberal, progressive, revolutionary opinions and ideas. Such distinguished divines as Tucker, Parsons, Hitchcock, Langdon, Mayhew, Stillman, Cooper, Payson, Gordon, Howard and many others were developed and broadened in this school of patriotism.

A few brief extracts will show the temper and thought of these men and their relation to the vast and far-reaching political questions of the times in which they lived. In the preface to a sermon preached in Boston June 30, 1750, by J. Mayhew, occurs this passage:

"God be thanked! one may in any part of the British dominions speak freely—if a decent regard be paid to those in authority—both of government and religion, and even give some broad hints that he is engaged on the side of liberty, the Bible, and common sense, in opposition to tyranny, priestcraft, and nonsense—without being in danger either of the Bastille or the Inquisition,—though there will always be some interested politicians, contracted bigots, and hypercritical zealots for a party, to take offence at such freedom. Their censure is praise, their praise is infamy."

And in the same sermon:

"It is evident that the affairs of civil government may properly fall under a moral and religious consideration—at least, so far forth as it relates to the general nature and end of magistracy, and to the ground and extent of that submission which persons of a private character ought to yield to those who are vested with authority. This must be allowed by all who acknowledge the divine original of Christianity."

The same bold speaker added in a note to the sermon:

"No civil rulers are to be obeyed when they enjoin things that are inconsistent with the commands of God. No government is to be submitted to at the expense of that which is the sole end of all government, the common good and safety of society. The only reason of the institution of civil government, and the only rational ground of submission to it, is the common safety and utility. If, therefore, in any case, the common safety and utility would not be promoted by submission to government, but the contrary, there is no ground or motion for obedience and submission, but for the contrary."

In an election sermon preached by Samuel Cooke, May 30, 1770, are these utterances:

"I trust on this occasion I may, without offence, plead the cause of our African slaves, and humbly propose the pursuit of some effectual measures at least to prevent the further importation of them. Difficulties insuperable, I apprehend, prevent an adequate remedy for what is past. Let the

time past more than suffice wherein we, the patrons of liberty, have dishonored the Christian name, and degraded human nature nearly to a level with the beasts that perish. Ethiopia has long stretched out her hands to us. Let not sordid gain, acquired by the merchandise of slaves and the souls of men, harden our hearts against her piteous moans. When God ariseth and and when he visiteth what shall we answer? May it be the glory of this province, of this respectable General Assembly, and, we could wish, of this session, to lead in the cause of the oppressed. This will avert the impending vengeance of Heaven, procure you the blessing of multitudes of your fellow men ready to perish, be highly approved of our common Father, who is no respecter of persons, and, we trust, an example which would excite the highest attention of our sister colonies."

Samuel Langdon, President of Harvard College, spoke thus in an election sermon, May 31, 1775 :

"If the great servants of the public forget their duty, betray their trust, and sell their country, or make war against the most valuable rights and privileges of the people, reason and justice require that they should be discarded, and others appointed in their room, without any regard to formal resignations of their forfeited powers."

On May 29, 1776, Samuel West delivered an election sermon, in which these opinions are given :

"The authority of a tyrant is of itself null and void. No body of men can justly and lawfully authorize any person to tyrannize over and enslave his fellow creatures, or do anything contrary to equity and goodness. As magistrates have no authority but what they derive from the people, whenever they act contrary to the public good, and pursue measures destructive of the peace and safety of the community, they forfeit their right to govern the people."

The preacher, if he be worthy of his profession, is called of God to the performance of the most solemn and important duties. The pulpit is the coign of vantage. All that the tribune is to the statesman, the platform to the lecturer, the chair to the professor, the pulpit is, and even more, to the preacher. The preacher is so identified with the pulpit that it is easy to so personify the pulpit that when we come to speak of politics and the pulpit we mean politics and the preacher. The preacher is always a man before he enters upon the discharge of the functions of his high and holy office. No inherent right of manhood is necessarily given up by the preacher. This is equally true of his citizenship. The preacher would be derelict to the plainest requirements of duty should he refuse to share the obligations and privileges which rest upon all his fellow citizens. There may be

exemption for some few of the minor responsibilities, but the essential ones are never really laid aside, much less ignored.

There are four principal requisites which especially go to make up a genuine preacher. First of all he must be a teacher of the people; and this involves the idea that he shall have a well-trained mind, that he shall be scholarly in his tastes and habits, and that he shall have abundant stores of knowledge. He must know men and things. He must be familiar with the past, alive to all present interests, and thoughtful concerning the future. Nothing that really affects the material, intellectual, or spiritual welfare of man must be outside of his range of thought and intelligent and comprehensive study. This will certainly bring him into intimate contact with living men, and will involve him in the affairs that interest his fellow men—and so connect politics and the pulpit.

The preacher must also be an example to all who come within the range of his influence. He is taken as an example whether he will or not. His example will be either harmful or helpful, as the case may be. His example is not limited by his public devotions and pulpit ministrations, nor by the tone of his voice, the expression of his countenance, or the style of his dress. His example has to do with private and public goodness. What is right and proper for the most blameless man to do in private and in public should be the standard of conduct on the part of the preacher. This principle will apply to his personal conduct everywhere ; he must be a gentleman without fear and without reproach, sensitive and sensible to the last degree where honor and integrity are involved. If he is to be an example in all things, he will of necessity find himself within the realm of politics, and here he must illustrate the highest type of patriotism, loyalty and righteousness.

Again, the preacher must be a leader, for if he fails in this respect the world has but very little use for him. His superior opportunities for the best culture place upon him the duty of leadership. If he has not the wisdom, nor the courage, nor the high spirit of consecration necessary for this, he will receive but very slight honor either from God or man. And this means much more than leadership in things that are purely intellectual or spiritual. It means that the preacher should have clear, definite, well-considered opinions on all matters that concern the safety,

welfare, and progress of the people. Nor will it be enough that he has these opinions and keeps them to himself. He must declare himself; his voice must ring out in defiance of a vicious public opinion; he must set forth and reiterate his convictions without fear or favor. The great lack of humanity in all the past, and even now, is in the right kind of leaders. When all others fail, it should be known that the preacher walks in the way of righteousness, and that it will be safe to follow where he leads.

Furthermore, the preacher should be a reformer. There has been no time of which we have any record on the pages of history where there have not been abuses. In every age there have been wrongs inflicted upon the weak by the hand of power. In every age there have been, and, even now, there are in every land, the down-trodden and the oppressed, the helpless victims of injustice. There is as yet no land where the pure and holy principles of the Gospel of the Son of God thoroughly prevail, where they perfectly permeate and leaven the masses so that all are secure in the possession and enjoyment of all their rights. The preacher, if he is true to his Master, will take his place among those who toil most earnestly and persistently for the amelioration of the condition of all who suffer from whatever cause. No preacher has any right to be a fanatic, or a visionary, or an impracticable. The foolishness of many so-called reformers consists in frantic and futile attempts to accomplish the impossible. The right way is to give careful thought to the evils that afflict society, then find out the remedy, then do the next thing, and the next thing, and the next thing, howsoever small it may be, until the remedy is applied and the evil removed. The text book of the preacher is the Bible. Every genuine reform that has ever blessed humanity has its germinal principle in the Bible. The Book of God, the Book of Humanity, the Bible, is full of reformations and revolutions, and every one of them if wisely inaugurated and prosecuted must be a source of blessing to the human race. If the preacher knows the Bible, if he follows its teachings, he will be a reformer, and constantly will he be found in the work of uplifting the weak, while at the same time he smites with all the power God has given him every outrage and every villany. He will follow the example of Jesus and Paul, the two greatest reformers the world has ever known, and fearlessly stand for truth and jus-

tice, no matter what the consequences may be to himself. The world needs

> "Preachers like Woolman,
> Or like those who bore
> The faith of Wesley
> To this western shore,
> And deemed no convert genuine till he broke
> Alike his servant's and the devil's yoke."

In these times in which we live there is as much need that preachers should be teachers, examples, leaders and reformers, as at any time in the history of Christianity or of the world. There are a thousand questions in which they need not especially concern themselves, and about which they need not discourse. But there are others which affect the intellectual and moral development of the people, and others still which are related in morals to the perpetuity of our free institutions, and others which are vital to the religious liberties and rights of the nation. The questions in either case need not be specified in detail; every intelligent person can enumerate and classify them. Concerning the first it is not expected that the clergy will undertake to instruct or control the people who may attend upon their ministrations. In regard to the second, every sensible, loyal, progressive American citizen holds firmly to the opinion that each preacher should wisely and at proper times discuss these all-important matters, and in the light of God's Word set forth the claims of duty, and by the highest moral persuasions incite and inspire all to its faithful performance. Any preacher who neglects so to do fails to answer the reasonable expectations of the people. He may not excuse himself with the vain plea that his congregation is made up of different parties, nor the still more worthless plea that he must not mix religion and politics. If he really loves God, if he loves his country, if he loves humanity, he must consider and discuss the great underlying principles that are essential to the continuance of good government and to the peace and prosperity of the country. He must condemn all moral and political wrongs, no matter how venerable, or respectable, or powerful, utterly regardless of what party may be responsible for their existence or continuance. He must voice the cry of the outraged and down-trodden of this and every other land. He must be the great-hearted champion of all the friendless and helpless.

He must strike down with the whole strength of his indignant manhood any giant evil that dares to threaten the high, and holy, and chivalrous hopes of all good people in behalf of pure homes and heaven-exalted native land.

Such political preachers will always be in demand, and will challenge the love and the confidence of the best, and bravest, and of all true patriots. Politics and religion, when both are what they should be, will blend harmoniously, and together bless and uplift the people, and at the same time render strong and permanent all that is most excellent in our social life and civil institutions.

WILLARD F. MALLALIEU.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS A STRATEGIST.

PART I.

BY ARCHIBALD FORBES.

In an unique variety of directions the great Civil War evoked the ready, versatile aptitude of the American citizen ; in none more remarkably than with regard to the superior military commands. By the defection of the great majority of the senior officers of the regular army, the North was left almost entirely denuded of available professional soldiers in the higher grades conversant with commands or experienced in war in the superior capacities. In the modern armies of the old world, high commands were then, as they still are, restricted to officers of long graduated military experience following on a technical professional education. Thanks to the comprehensive and thorough training of West Point, the officerhood of the army of the United States possessed a professional training of unequalled theoretical and practical efficiency and range. The seniors who went South carried with them in the nature of things the greater proportion of higher professional experience ; but by reason of the national idiosyncracy combined with the justifiable self-confidence imparted by the West Point training, the comparative lack of experience in superior positions had singularly little if any adverse influence. There are two kinds of experience—the experience of routine, and the experience of initiative, resource, and decision. It was experience of the latter type which the Northern captains and majors, promoted by leaps and bounds to high commands, matched and assimilated with their West Point teachings in their swift advance ; and a couple of campaigns made them truer veterans in the soldierly sense of the word than any amount of unwarlike longevity could have done.

But the national aptitude was exemplified yet more saliently in the rapid yet thoroughly justified rise to high commands of men whom the outbreak of the war found innocent, or all but innocent, of any military training or experience. Sickles's first commission was signed in June, 1861, but he was a corps-commander at Chancellorsville, and it was with the intuition of a true tactician that at Gettysburg he was resolute to place his corps in that Peach Orchard position, his tenure of which balked Lee's desire to occupy it to advantage with his artillery and Longstreet's infantry. He left a limb there, but none of his alert versatility; when last I saw him he was vigorously indoctrinating Castelar and Figueras into the methods of "running" the newborn and short-lived Spanish republic. Blair was a civilian politician until the outbreak of the war, but he commanded the Eighteenth Corps with credit in Sherman's Atlanta campaign. Logan, it is true, had served as a volunteer in Mexico, but that service was a mere incident in the civilian career which was interrupted by the Civil War, throughout which he fought with great distinction and, in Sherman's phrase, "nobly sustained his reputation" in the command of the Army of the Tennessee before Atlanta after the fall of the lamented McPherson.

Yet another strange military phenomenon did this war present. The chief of staff of all men in an army is the man on whom devolves the most arduous, wide-ranging, technical, and responsible duties; his professional knowledge is expected to be all but universal, his experience profound, his military judgment prompt and ripe. Among famous chiefs of staff have been Gneisenau, Berthier, Soult, Jomini, Mansfield, Moltke, Voghts-Retz, Blumenthal, Stiele, all educated and trained soldiers, conversant, practically and theoretically, with the art of war. Among the chiefs of staff in the Union armies Humphreys and Webb were educated soldiers of exceptional professional ability; Marcy, of the domestic, if not nepotic, type of chief of staff, was at all events a graduate of West Point and had seen frontier service. But Rawlins, Garfield, and Butterfield were destitute of any military education or training, having been pure civilians until the beginning of the war. Such experience as they possessed had come to them in the rough-and-ready school of active warfare, yet each filled the exceptionally onerous part of chief of staff to a great army in the field, and against none of those

quasi-extempore specialists has the most censorious critic adventured a charge of inefficiency.

That phase of aptitude for the art military which is capable of developing itself in true and far-seeing conception of strategical considerations of the higher order, is an attribute of singular rarity. It is intuitive; the possessor of it may live and die unaware of the endowment, unless circumstances occur which evoke its exercise. No assiduity of study or practice will earn it in its fullest for the man whom nature has not gifted, while it may reveal itself almost by surprise in one who is unaware that Clausewitz and Hamley have written a line, and who has never witnessed the setting of a squadron in the field. The warrior illuminated with this spark of natural genius is the great commander of his age—he is an Alexander, a Cæsar, a Frederick, a Napoleon. In the civilian possessor it may lie wholly obscured and dormant; while, again, it has irradiated and inspired a Rienzi, a Luther, a Loyola. Ready-witted, many-sided, zealous and ardent as were the soldiers of the Union alike professional and volunteer, it cannot be maintained that in the early days of the Civil War any one of them gave manifestation that heaven had endowed him with the gift of a strategic genius. But the attribute was present in the rich mental equipment of the great civilian whom the wisdom of Providence placed at the head of the State in that time of trouble. It is the object of the present writer to elucidate the fact that Abraham Lincoln was gifted with the faculty of intuitive strategic perception in a degree which, by reason of the multiplicity of other eminent qualities which adorned the character of that illustrious man, has not received adequate recognition at the hands of his countrymen. It is with natural diffidence that a foreigner ventures to undertake this task; but the doing of it has been long on his mind, and a well-intentioned effort cannot be taken as an impertinence.

It is quite improbable that his experience as a captain of mounted volunteers in the Black Hawk War should have awakened in Lincoln any consciousness of his possession of strategic aptitude. His biographers * tell us that during McClellan's illness in December, 1861, the President "gave himself night and day to the study of the military situation. He read a large number of strategical works. He held long conferences with

* Nicolay and Hay, Vol. 5, p. 155.

eminent generals and admirals, and astonished them by his special knowledge and the keen intelligence of his questions." But five months earlier, in the midst of the dismay and the disorganization resulting from the *débâcle* of Bull Run, without the benefit of the study of "strategical works," and independently of the counsels of "eminent generals and admirals," Lincoln had composed a memorandum defining the military policy and measures which in his judgment were the lessons of the reverse just incurred. The whole of this document, wise and far-seeing as were its terms, need not be quoted. Its various clauses enjoin refrainment for the time from offensive operations, the maintenance of the existing positions, and the sedulous organization of the new levies into methodized and disciplined armies. Those matters specified, the President set down the following pregnant injunction:

"When the foregoing shall have been substantially attended to: Let Manassas Junction (or some point on one or other of the railroads near it) and Strasburg be seized and permanently held, with an open line from Washington to Manassas, and an open line from Harper's Ferry to Strasburg —the military men to find the way of doing these things."

If Lincoln had never written another sentence, these lines would evince his possession of an accurate mental *coup d'œil*, and an instinctive discernment of strategic points of profound importance at once in a military and a political sense. What was the obvious military policy of the North? Of course its dominant purpose was to put down the rebellion. But as regarded the line of the Potomac there were peculiar conditions, some natural, some artificial, indeed, but none the less stringent, which interposed themselves to the complication of the main problem.

The National Capital stood on the very outer edge of Union territory. The Shenandoah Valley was for the South a protected avenue leading northward into the rear of Washington and straight towards the heart of the most fertile provinces of the Union. The conviction of many wise Southerners may have been right—and that conviction has been warmly supported by Colonel Chesney—that invasions of Northern territory by Southern armies were deplorable mistakes; and that, quite apart from military results, it was throwing away a great political advantage to reduce what should have been a purely defensive struggle for rights to the lower level of aggressive fighting for retaliation and mastery. Be

this as it may, it would appear unquestionable that the primary duty of the North, a duty coming in front of that ulterior duty of reducing the South to submission, was to take measures for securing its own soil from outrage, and its capital from insult. In a war between hostile nations invasion is reckoned a triumph for the invader and a humiliation to the invaded ; how much more cogent are those ascriptions in such a contest as that which the North was waging against the South ? Nor, indeed, to the former were the sentimental humiliation and the injuries inflicted on the population of the territory overrun all the despite and damage that invasion by the latter might involve ; on the invading bayonets until the catastrophe of Gettysburg there hovered the contingency of the recognition of the South by the European powers.

Such considerations, when Johnston's foreposts were within sight of the Capitol, and when McDowell's raw levies had degenerated into a mob, must have been vitally present in Lincoln's mind when he wrote the injunction which is quoted above. Before the strong man armed should go forth again to the battle, he would take precautions for the keeping of his own house. The President's directions in this regard betoken a singular insight. Had he been a practical soldier he would probably have specified the occupation of an intermediate strategic point in front of Salem at the apex of the salient bend made by the Manassas Gap Railroad, to divide the long interval between the positions at Manassas and at Strasburg ; and perhaps rather than in the latter vicinity he would have located the position in the Shenandoah Valley somewhere about midway between Strasburg and Cedarville, so as to cover the Manassas and Chester gaps and the Luray road down the Massanutten Valley, as well as the great pike traversing the main valley.

It is not too much to say that those three positions, strongly fortified and adequately armed for permanent occupation, capable each of holding 10,000 to 15,000 men, would have protected Union territory from invasion from the lower Potomac on the east to the North Mountains range on the west, and would have mitigated if not dispelled the chronic anxiety for the protection of the National Capital, which for years clogged the enterprise of the Northern forces in the eastern section of the theatre of war. Had those fortress camps been created, strong for defence and possessing important potentialities of offence, one or other of

them would have been in the path of a hostile army moving upon Washington by whatever line of advance, since that army neither could have afforded to mask the obstacle, nor could have passed it unregarded, leaving its own communications in peril. Consider what those positions would have affected, averted, obstructed. The pestilent guerillas of Loudoun and Fauquier would have been cowed. The rich region of the lower Shenandoah would have been alienated from Confederate uses and its produce been at the service of the North. In face of the barrier which the Strasburg position would have presented, Jackson's campaign of May-June, 1862, the prescribed scheme of which was "to press the enemy at Harper's Ferry, threaten invasion into Maryland, and an attempt on Washington, and thus make the most energetic diversion possible," could not have been prosecuted, and probably would never have been enjoined; McDowell would have joined the Army of the Potomac, and the Peninsular campaign might have had another issue.

Had there been entrenched positions at Salem and Manassas there would have been no second Bull Run, since neither Jackson nor Longstreet would have ventured through Thoroughfare Gap, having the Salem position on flank and in rear, and since the Manassas position would have covered Pope's depot of supplies and have afforded his army a protective gathering-point, to assail which would have been rash, and to turn which would have been reckless. Had there been no second Bull Run Lee would not have adventured his Maryland campaign. But, even assuming Pope to have been crushed, if the positions indicated by Lincoln had existed Lee would assuredly have thought twice before moving into Maryland, leaving them in his rear on his lines of communication. Long admits that the unexpected discovery of a garrison in Harper's Ferry paralyzed the execution of his chief's ulterior designs pending the reduction of that place, which fell by a *coup de main*. These designs Lee would scarcely have entertained in the full knowledge of the potential influence of those positions which he must have possessed had they existed—places too strong to be attempted by a *coup de main*. He would have found them formidable if not insurmountable obstacles to the prosecution of the campaign in Pennsylvania to which he directed himself after the victory of Chancellorsville. During his great opponent's long-drawn-out movement athwart Virginia, Hooker could find or

make no opportunity for acting on Lincoln's quaintly-put suggestion: "If the head of Lee's army is at Martinsburg and the tail of it at Fredericksburg, the animal must be very slim somewhere. Could you not break him?" Pleasanton, indeed, claimed to have enforced on Lee the valley route to the Potomac instead of that to the eastward of the Blue Ridge. But on either line Lee would have found one of the fortress camps enjoined by Lincoln in his memorandum of June 1861, had effect been given to its requirement. From either or from both positions the "animal" in its slimness would have run risk of damage, although scarcely that of severance; they would have been too strong to be taken without regular approaches and seige artillery, one or other of them would have threatened Lee's communications whatever line they could have followed, and he must have left a division to observe the menacing one, a weakening of force he could ill afford.

Finally, there can be little question that if there had been a strongly entrenched position in the vicinity of Strasburg, Early, in the summer of 1864, would never have seen the lower valley, far less have fought on the Monocacy and fluttered the Volscians of the Washingtonian Corioli. For in that case Hunter, withdrawing from his stroke at Lynchburg, would have made shift to retire on that position down the valley instead of diverging as he did into the Kanawha region, in default of support short of the Potomac.

None of those entrenched positions was ever constructed. In no case was there any material hindrance. For the work to be done east of Manassas Gap there was available the interval between Johnston's withdrawal from before Washington in March and Pope's retreat in the end of August, 1862. Throughout the winter of 1861–62 Jackson never had more than 4,000 men in the Shenandoah Valley, and if during that time Johnston's presence at Manassas had contributed to deter from construction work in the Strasburg vicinity, the interval between Jackson's retirement after Kernstown and his re-descent on Banks more than a month later, would have sufficed for the work. Why the President's injunction was not impetrated, I know not; nor does its non-fulfilment in any degree affect the argument for Lincoln's strategic discernment based upon its terms.

It cannot be denied that McClellan, notwithstanding the de-

fects of his military idiosyncracy, was a scientific officer of exceptional capacity. There is no evidence whether or not he knew of Lincoln's memorandum, but the following extract from that melancholy publication, "McClellan's Own Story," is a remarkable tribute, conscious or unconscious, to the President's strategic prescience as illustrated in the memorandum quoted above:

"The instructions I gave (before leaving for the Peninsula) were to the effect that Manassas Junction should be strongly entrenched . . . . and that General Banks should put the mass of his force there . . . . ; the railroad from Washington to Manassas, and thence to Strasburg, to be at once put in running order, and protected by blockhouses . . . . a force to be strongly entrenched at or near the point where the railroad crosses the Shenandoah, Chester Gap to be also occupied by a detachment well entrenched. . . . Under the arrangement the immediate approaches to Washington would be covered by a strong force well entrenched and able to fall back on the city if overpowered; while if the enemy advanced down the Shenandoah the force entrenched at Strasburg would be able to hold him in check until assistance could reach it by rail from Manassas. If these measures had been carried into effect Jackson's subsequent advance down the Shenandoah would have been impracticable . . . . and, again, with Manassas entrenched as I directed, Pope would have had a secure base of operations from which to manœuvre, and the result of his campaign might have been very different."

One paragraph of Lincoln's memorandum written immediately after the Bull Run disaster has been quoted and its strategic potentialities elucidated. There followed it another paragraph which, as strengthening the argument for the President's possession of instinctive strategic perception, is not less worthy of notice. It runs thus: "This done,"—viz., the things enjoined in a previous paragraph—"a joint movement from Cairo on Memphis; and from Cincinnati on East Tennessee."

Commodore Davis occupied Memphis within a year after this sentence was penned; but it was not until fifteen months later that Burnside marched into Knoxville, and the staunch loyalists of East Tennessee had to suffer and endure for several months longer before they were able to call themselves once more entirely free. Yet before the blood of the first pitched battle of the war was dry the President was illustrating by the precept just quoted his full and anxious consciousness, not less of the strategic than of the political importance of the occupation of East Tennessee by the Union arms; for the hill country of East Tennessee, with the northwestern section of North Carolina, was a re-entering wedge

of loyal unionism penetrating the vitals of the Confederacy. It was traversed by the railway line which constituted the main link of connection between the eastern and the western and southwestern railroad systems of the rebel power—a line the dislocation of which would entail on that power the most serious mischief. "A glance at the map," write Lincoln's most recent biographers,* "and a study of attendant circumstances, can leave no doubt that it was entirely possible to have seized and held the mountain region of East Tennessee, and that such an occupation would have been a severance of the rebel Confederacy almost as complete and damaging to its military strength as the opening of the Mississippi."

In the end of September, 1861, the President followed up his curt precept of July with a more detailed and specific direction. "I wish," he wrote, "a movement made to seize and hold a point on the railroad connecting Virginia and Tennessee, near the mountain pass called Cumberland Gap." After an accurate summary of the military situation on either side in and about the region such an advance would traverse, he expresses his intention that it and McClellan's projected movement in the coast region should be made simultaneously. While preparations were in course, the vigilant defensive was to be maintained. When all should be ready, he directs that Sherman, remaining immobile in his position southward of Louisville, should simply "hold" his adversary, Buckner, "while all [the troops] at Cincinnati and all at Louisville, with all on the line, concentrate rapidly at Lexington, and thence [march] to Thomas's camp [at Camp Dick Robinson, on the way to Cumberland Gap], joining him, and the whole [move] thence upon the Gap." Recognizing the existing difficulties of transport, the indefatigable man introduced into his message to Congress, in the beginning of December, 1861, a recommendation, "as a military measure," of the construction of a strategic railway, from the most advisable point on the existing system, across eastern Kentucky into East Tennessee; an operation which, if carried out, would probably have shortened the war. He inspired McClellan, promoted *per saltum* to the command of the army of the United States, with the zeal for the military occupation of East Tennessee which burned in himself; and that chief kept impressing on Buell, whom he had commissioned to

*Nicolay and Hay, Vol. V., p. 73.

the service, his conviction that "strategical and political considerations alike render a prompt movement in force on East Tennessee imperative." How Buell, disregarding his commanding officer's strenuous representations and the President's trenchant comment that he "would rather have a point on the railroad south of the Cumberland Gap than Nashville, because it cuts a great artery of the enemy's communication, which Nashville does not,"—how Buell, I repeat, took his own stiff, refractory way—are not those things written in the chronicles of the perturbed period? But that Buell was self-willed and contumacious cannot obscure the recognition of Lincoln's prompt and shrewd perception, and of his anxious prosecution of correct strategical objects and methods having for their result the military and political utilization of the East Tennessee region.

For seven long months, from the disaster of Bull Run until the beginning of March, 1862, the Union underwent a period of grievous humiliation. Within sight of the dome of the National Capitol stood the outposts of a rebel army, whose cannon commanded the lower Potomac, and the mass of which held an entrenched position within a couple of easy marches from the Washington defences. Against this degrading situation, long endured with exemplary patience, the nation and its head at length began to chafe; and in the beginning of December, 1861, Lincoln handed to the military chief whom already he was gradually finding out, a memorandum outlining an operation having for its object the dislodgement of Johnston from his insolent position at Manassas. Its terms, slightly condensed, are as follows (the figures were furnished by McClellan):

"Suppose that 50,000 of the troops southwest of the river (Potomac) move forward and menace the enemy at Centreville. That 21,000, being the remainder of the available force now there move rapidly to the crossing of the Occoquan by the road through Alexandria towards Richmond; there to be joined by the 33,000 men now being the whole movable force from northeast of the river, which, having been landed from the Potomac just below the mouth of the Occoquan, should move by land up the south side [right bank] 'of that stream to the crossing point indicated' [where the two bodies should unite]; and then the whole move together by the road thence, to Brentville and beyond to the [Orange and Alexandria] railroad just south of its crossing at Broad Run, the railroad bridges having been previously destroyed by a cavalry detachment sent forward in advance."

In so far as it concerned "grand strategy"—the correct recognition of the point at which it was imperative to strike—this memoran-

dum is unexceptionable ; in the practical strategic detail which consisted in the effective direction of troops on that decisive point, it is perhaps less happy. The expressed conviction of General McDowell, it is true, cannot be disregarded, that the result of a movement in force on both flanks of the enemy must result in a battle in which the Northern forces would be victorious. Every respect is due to the opinion of that good and honest soldier. But it is unquestionable that the project as outlined involved in full measure the proverbial risks and uncertainties of a combined movement engaged in with raw troops in an unfamiliar country, complicated by unascertained obstacles and imperfect intercommunication, and thus liable to the contingency of failure to accomplish simultaneous coöperation. If, indeed, that simultaneous coöperation came off deftly, then certainly Johnston would have found himself in that disagreeable predicament which German soldiers knew by the term, "In der taktischen Mitte." But if the Northern forces had failed to keep punctual tryst, then, and yet more fully, had he taken the prompt offensive, would Johnston have been in the enjoyment of the beneficent phase of interior lines. Nearly of equal strength as he was to each of the proposed Northern contingents, his opportunities of timely information, his divers alternatives of action, and his possession of an entrenched position from which to sally and into which to retire, seemed to bring it within the bounds of possibility that the rebel general might still have been at Manassas after having sent both of the Federal bodies back to their lines in discomfiture.

After keeping the President's memorandum for some ten days, McClellan returned it with the unceremoniously curt observation: "Information received recently leads me to believe that the enemy could meet us with nearly equal forces ; and I have now my mind actively turned towards another plan of campaign that I do not think at all anticipated by the enemy, nor by many of our own people."

So far as I can discover, this is McClellan's first allusion to the project of a campaign against Richmond from a base on the Chesapeake. There is no hint of such a scheme in his wide-ranging memorandum of August 2 ; its tenor, indeed, is rather to the contrary. So late, indeed, as the end of November he intimated that the "crushing defeat" of the rebel army "at Manassas" was the great object to be accomplished ; and that

the advance upon it "should not be postponed beyond November 25." Lincoln's proposal was simply an echo of the national feeling and anxiety put into definite shape. McClellan was not a fighting general; shall we greatly err in putting forward the suggestion, that, since he began to perceive he would be squarely forced to go against Johnston if he had no other feasible alternative to substitute, he invented the Chesapeake project during those ten days as a plausible evasion of an unpalatable compulsion? But, so it may be replied, *cœlum non animam mutant*—McClellan must have laid his account with having some fighting from his Chesapeake base, and was not deterred by this prospect from penetrating to the vicinity of Richmond: what, then, justifies the surmise that it was a repugnance to fighting which deterred him from trying conclusions with Johnston at Manassas? The clear answer to this is that McClellan was just as reluctant to fight in the Peninsula and before Richmond as he was in front of Washington; and this for the same baseless reason. He did not fight Johnston at Manassas because he believed, or affected to believe, that his adversary could oppose 150,000 men to his own 100,000. It was simply the logical sequence that he should not fight when he found himself before Richmond with 100,000 men whom he called 85,000, while in his imagination the adversary standing over against him was 200,000 strong.*

When one speaks of fighting, it is of course offensive battles, or defensive battles accepted deliberately, not on compulsion but with a strategic object, which are meant. The stubborn and bloody conflicts sustained in front of Richmond by the staunch and gallant Army of the Potomac were all fought on the compulsory defensive, and the discomfiture of that brave host was wholly wrought by its chief's studied declinature of the timely initiative. At no one of those battles was he present in person save during a part of Malvern Hill. If Williamsburg is to be styled an offensive battle, McClellan was miles in the rear until late in the afternoon of the second day's fighting; and when he did arrive, he characteristically proceeded to convert what offensive there had been into the passive defensive, an attitude which naturally resulted in the nocturnal withdrawal of the enemy. The only two offensive battles fought by McClellan he engaged in after he had seen the cards in his adversary's hand.

* "McClellan's Own Story," p. 392.

There are three types of commander: he who both organizes and fights; he who can fight but cannot organize; he who has a superlative gift for organization, but cannot fight. McClellan was a commander of the last type.

The military situation in Washington, in January 1862, was one of extreme tension. The President, who by the constitution was commander in chief of the armed forces of the United States, supported by the voice of the nation and the counsel of wise and disinterested generals, had pronounced for a direct advance from the Washington base. McClellan, on the other hand, who was General in Chief of the army of the United States, was set on a counter project of a movement on Richmond by the lower Chesapeake. Which of these two powers was to prevail? For the time, at least, it seemed that the head of the State was resolved to assert to the uttermost the courage of his convictions. Of his own unaided instance he issued a "General War Order"—corresponding in effect to the "General Idea" for a campaign with which soldiers are familiar—directing that on a day named (February 22) there should begin a simultaneous general movement of the land and sea forces of the Union against the insurgent forces; specifying in detail the several commands which should take part in this great operation; and enacting that all civil and military officers, including the general in chief, were to be "severally held to their strict and full responsibility for prompt execution of this order." The date for action which it specified was probably premature, but apart from this detail, the full significance of this order seems, in a strategic sense, to deserve greater recognition than has ever been accorded to it. To Grant, in his promotion to the command of the Union armies, has been credited the earliest realization of the inadequate results obtained by the disconnected and inharmonious action of the various commands; and his altered method of a "simultaneous movement all along the line"—his "design to work all parts of the army together, and somewhat towards a common centre"—has always been held, and justly so, an evidence of his genius for "grand strategy." But Lincoln, pure civilian as he was, by his order of January 27, 1862, had anticipated the gifted and practised soldier by more than two years in the appreciation of the advantages of concerted action towards a common purpose.

Following naturally on his "General War Order," there was

issued by the President to General McClellan a "Special War Order"—the "Special Idea" of the soldier—commanding that the Army of the Potomac, after due provision for the safety of Washington, should move out with the object of "seizing and occupying a point on the railroad southwestward of Manassas Junction, the advance to begin on or before February 22." It is to be noted that the risky strategy of the December memorandum was now abandoned in favor of the better policy of undivided forces directed on a truer objective.

These "War Orders" were definite, deliberate, and momentous deliverances, sternly enjoining obedience on all whom they concerned, specifically on the General-in-Chief. Yet three days after the issue of the "Special Order," Lincoln was writing thus to McClellan: "You and I have distinct and different plans for a movement of the Army of the Potomac. . . . If you will give me satisfactory answers to the following questions I shall gladly yield my plan to yours." The questions need not be quoted; in effect they ask in what respects the Chesapeake plan was superior to the Manassas plan. McClellan's reply was voluminous, plausible, and full of ingenious special pleading. Could McClellan have fought as well as he wrote, he would have taken rank among the great commanders.

It seems obvious, however, that the question at issue was not in any possible sense one of alternative or competition between Manassas and the lower Chesapeake, seeing that in the nature of things, not less for the national self-respect than as a military necessity, Johnston had to be conclusively dislodged before the other adventure could be gone upon. It appears extraordinary that neither the President nor the council of war of general officers of the Army of the Potomac convened by McClellan at the President's instance should have given expression to any conciousness of the obligatory character of this sequence of enterprises. It was almost as if in regard to this all-important point the masterfulness of McClellan had hypnotized President and generals into blindness. The majority of the council voted in favor of the Chesapeake project *simpliciter*. Keyes followed suit on condition of the previous reduction of the Confederate batteries commanding the Potomac; no voice among eight concurrents was raised to stipulate for the prior molestation of Johnston. The President, having sacrificed his own convictions and gone counter

to the feeling of the nation, had no reservations in his support of McClellan's plan save that the security of Washington should be insured, and that the Potomac should be freed from the dominance of the rebel batteries. As for McClellan, certainly he had no intention of driving the Confederate army from the vicinity of the National Capital, and so little did he regard the inconvenience and humiliation of the blockade of the Potomac by rebel batteries that it was with great reluctance he made preparations to obey the positive orders for the dislodgement, nor was he ashamed to have the rendezvous at Annapolis of the transport for his projected expedition.

So far as molestation at McClellan's hands was concerned, Johnston's outposts might have watched, or, indeed, hurried, the embarkation of McClellan's final detail. If McClellan's all-but-accomplished attempt had succeeded, to leave Washington garrisoned by a few thousand efficients, the stars and bars might have been seen in Pennsylvania Avenue. In such an event, even on the absurd assumption that Richmond was to the Confederacy what Washington was to the Union, the prompt "swapping of Queens," to use Lee's later phrase, was by no means assured when a half share in the transaction was on McClellan's hands. Had Johnston found Washington too hard a nut to crack, he might nevertheless well have held the attempt worth making; and with his command of railroads, and his knowledge, to quote himself, that "McClellan seems not to value time especially," he might fairly have laid his account with reaching Richmond in advance of that commander after having failed to occupy Washington.

Johnston's withdrawal from Manassas in early March was not, as McClellan and his supporters maintained, because of his discovery of the Chesapeake scheme. In his memoirs the Confederate commander specifically states that his retirement was wholly due to the apprehension that the Federal army was preparing to move through Maryland under cover of the Potomac, and cross the river to the mouth of the Potomac Creek, where it would be at least two days' marches nearer Richmond than was the Army of Northern Virginia on Bull Run. But for this incontrovertible evidence it would be incredible that Johnston should have known nothing of McClellan's plan of campaign until the preparations were all but complete, when it is remembered that Stanton had publicly advertised for transports in the middle of

February, and that the ports of preparation and assemblage were full of Southern sympathizers. The underground telegraph in those early days must have worked badly.

ARCHD. FORBES.

PREHISTORIC TIMES IN EGYPT AND PALESTINE.

BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

II.

THE remarkable record of the early distribution of the sons of Noah ("Toledoth" of the sons of Noah), in Genesis X., may be regarded, relatively to most of the nations it refers to, as a scrap of prehistoric lore of the most intensely interesting character. From the old "Phaleg" of Bochart to the recent commentaries of Delitzch and other German scholars, it has received a host of more or less conjectural explanations; and while all agree in extolling its value and importance as a "Beginning of History," nothing can be more various than the views taken of it. Only in the light of the recent discoveries and researches already referred to can we arrive at a clear conception of its import; but with these and some common sense we may hope to be more fortunate than the older interpreters. It is necessary, however, to explain here that, for want of a little scientific precision, many modern archæologists still fail in their interpretations. They tell us that the Toledoth are not properly "ethnological," but rather "ethnographical," and that we are to regard the document as referring, not to the genealogical affiliations of nations, but to their accidental geographical positions at the time of the record.

Now this is precisely what the writer, with a sure scientific instinct, carefully guards against, and explicitly informs us he did not intend. He tells us that he gives the "*generations* of the sons of Noah" and their descendants, and at the ends of the three lists relating to these sons he is careful to say that he has given them "in their lands, each according to his language, after their families, in their nations," or the formula is slightly varied into "after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations." Lastly, in the conclusion of the whole table he reiterates, "These are the *families* of the sons of Noah, according to their generations, after their nations." All these statements, let it be observed, are acknowledged to be parts of one (Elohistic) document. It is clear, therefore, that the writer intends us to

understand that the determining elements of his classification are neither physical characters nor accidents of geographical distribution, but descent and original language—two primary and scientific grounds of classification, and which common sense requires us to adhere to in interpreting the document, whose value will depend on the certainty with which the writer could ascertain facts as to these criteria: criteria which are, of course, less open to the observation of later inquirers, who may find difficulty in ascertaining either descent or *original* language, and in default of these may be obliged to resort to other grounds of classification.

It may be said, however, that if taken in the sense obviously intended by the writer, the list will not correspond with the facts. If so, so much the worse for it. A few data have, however, to be taken into the account in order to give this early writer fair play.

1. The record has nothing to do with antediluvian peoples or with survivors of the deluge other than the sons of Noah, if there were any such. Therefore, those ethnologists who are sceptical as to the historical deluge, and who postulate an uninterrupted advance of man through long ages of semi-bestial brutality, have nothing in common with our narrator, and cannot possibly believe his statements.

2. The document does not profess to be a series of ethnological inferences from the present or ancient characters of different nations, but an actual historical statement of the known migrations of men from a common centre in Shinar, the Sumir of the Chaldeans.

3. It relates only to the primary distribution of men from their alleged centre, over certain districts of Western Asia, Eastern Europe and Northern Africa, and does not profess to know anything of their subsequent migrations or history.

4. It is thus not responsible for those later, even if very ancient, changes which displaced one race by another or obliged one race to move on by the pressure of another, nor for any changes of language or mixtures of races which may have occurred in these movements.

5. It affirms nothing as to the physical characters of the races referred to, except as they may be inferred from heredity, but it implies some resemblance in language between the derivatives of the same stock, and this, be it observed, notwithstanding the

added narrative of the confusion of tongues at Babel,* which the narrator does not regard as interfering with the fact of languages originally forming a few branches proceeding from a common stock.

6. If we ask what our narrator supposed to be the original or Noachic tongue, we might infer from his three lines of descent, and from the locality of the dispersion and the episode of Nimrod's prehistoric kingdom, that the primitive language of Chaldea would be the original stem ; and this we now know from authentic written records to have been an agglutinate language of the type usually known as Turanian, and more closely allied to the Tartar and Chinese tongues than to other kinds of speech. It would follow that what we now call Semitic and Aryan or Japhetic forms of speech must, in the view of our ancient authority, date from the sequelæ of the great "confusion of tongues."

These points being premised, we can clear away the fogs which have been gathered around this little luminous spot in the early history of the world, and can trace at least the principal ethnic lines of radiation from it. Though the writer gives us three main branches of affiliation of the children of Noah, he really refers to six principal lines of migration, three of them belonging to that multifarious progeny of Ham, in which he seems to include both the Turanian and Negroid types of our ordinary classifications, as well as some of the brown and yellow races.

One of the lines of affiliation of Ham leads eastward and is not traced ; but if the Cushite people who are said to have gone up the Pison to the land which in earlier antediluvian times was that of "gold and bedolach and shoham stone," that is along the fertile valley of Susiana, were those primitive people preceding the Elamites of history who are said to have spoken an agglutinate language,† then we have at least one stage of this migration.

* Held by some to belong to another (Jahvistic) document, but certainly incorporated by the early editor.

† Sayce, ("Hibbert lectures") and Bagster's "Records of the Past." Inscriptions of Cyrus published in the last volume of the latter appear to set at rest the vexed questions relating to early Elam. It would seem that in the earliest times Cushites and Semitic Elamites contended for the fertile plains and the mountains east of the Tigris, and were finally subjugated by Japhetic Medes and Persians. Thus this region first formed a part of the Cushite Nimrodic empire (Gen. II., 11, X., 8); it then became the seat of a conquering Elamite power (Gen. XIV., 1 to 4); and was finally a central part of the Medo-Persian empire. All this agrees with the Bible and the inscriptions, as well as in the main with Herodotus.

A second line leads west to the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, to Egypt and to North Africa. A third passes southwestward through Southern Arabia and across the Red Sea into interior Africa. To the sons of Japhet are ascribed two lines of migration, one through Asia Minor and the northern coasts of the Mediterranean; another northwest, around the Black Sea. The Semites would seem to have been a less wandering people at the first, but subsequently to have encroached on and mingled with the Hamites, and especially on that western line of migration leading to the Mediterranean. All this can be gathered from undisputed national names in the several lines of migration above sketched, without touching on the more obscure and doubtful names or referring to tribes which remained near the original centre. We must, however, inquire a little more particularly into the movements bearing on Palestine and Egypt.

So far as the writer in Genesis is informed, he does not seem to be aware of any sons of Japhet having colonized Palestine or Egypt. It was only in the later reflux of population that the sons of Javan gained a foothold in these regions. They were both colonized primarily by Hamites and subsequently intruded on by Semites.

Here a little prehistoric interlude noted by the writer, or by an author whom he quotes, gives a valuable clue not often attended to. The oldest son of Ham, Cush, begat Nimrod, the mighty hunter and prehistoric conquerer, who organized the first empire in that Euphratean plain which subsequently became the nucleus of the Babylonian and Assyrian power. The site of his kingdom cannot be doubted, for cities well known in historic times, Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh were included in it, as well as probably Nineveh. The first point which I wish to make in this connection is that we cannot suppose this to have been a Semitic empire. Its nucleus must have been composed of Nimrod's tribal connections, who were Hamites and presumably Cushites. He is, indeed, said to have gone into or invaded the land of Ashur, and, if by this is meant the Semitic Ashur, he must have been hostile to these people, as indeed the Chaldeans were in later times. The next point to be noted is that the Nimrodic empire must have originated at a time when the Cushites were still strong on the Lower Euphrates, and before that great movement of these people which carried them across Arabia to

the Upper Nile and ultimately caused the name Cush or Kesh to be almost exclusively applied to the Ethiopians of Africa. Now is this history, or mere legend ?

The answer of archæology is not doubtful. We have in the earliest monuments of Chaldea evidence that there was a pre-Semitic population, to whom, indeed, it is believed that the Semites who invaded the country owed much of their civilization. A recent writer has said that "outside of the Bible we know nothing of Nimrod," but others see a trace of him in the legendary hero of Chaldean tradition, Gisdubar or Gingamos, while others think that, as Na-marod, he may be the original of Merodach, the tutelary god of Babylon. Independently of this, there was certainly an early Chaldean and "Turanian" empire, which must have had some founder, whatever his name, and which was not Semitic or Aryan, and therefore what an early writer would call Hamitic. Further, our author traces from this region the great Cushite line of migration, which includes such well-known names as Seba, Sabta, Sheba and Dedan, into Arabia on the way to Africa. Here the Egyptian monuments take up the tale, and inform us of a South Arabian and East African people, the people of Pun or Punt, represented as like to themselves and to the Kesh or Ethiopians, and who thus correspond to the Arabian Cushites of Genesis. In accordance with this the Abyssinian of to-day is scarcely distinguishable from the old Punites as represented on the Egyptian monuments.*

Thus the primitive Cushite kingdom and one of the great lines of Cushite migration are established by ancient monuments. Let it be further observed that, as represented in Egypt, these primitive Ethiopians were not black, but of a reddish or brownish color, like the Egyptians themselves, and that their migration explains the resemblance of the customs and religion of early Egypt to those of Babylonia, and the ascription by the Egyptians of the origin of their gods to the land of Pun.

The remaining sons of Ham, Mizraim, Put and Canaan, are not mentioned in connection with the old Nimrodic kingdom, and seem to have moved westward at a very early period. They were already "in the land," and apparently constituted a considerable citizen population before the migration of Abraham.

* The recent discoveries of Glaser with reference to the early civilization of Southern Arabia also bear on this point.

Mizraim represents the twin populations of the Delta and Lower Egypt, and the Tel-el-Amarna tablets inform us that long before the time of Moses Mitzor was the ordinary name of Egypt, while we know that its early population was closely allied in features and language to the Cushites.

Canaan* heads a central line of migration, and Sidon and Cheth are said to have been his leading sons. The first represents the Phœnician maritime power of Northern Syria, the second that great nation known to the Egyptians as Kheta and to the Assyrians as Khatti, whose territory extended from Carchemish on the Euphrates through the great plain of Coele-Syria to Hebron in Southern Palestine and not improbably into the Delta. They were a people whose language was allied to that of Cushite Chaldea,† whose features were of a coarser type than those of their more southern confrères, and who, according to the Egyptian annals, were closely allied with the Amorites, Jebusites and other people identified with Canaan in the Old Testament. The Cheta, at one time known only as the sons of Heth in the old Testament, may be said in our time to have experienced a sudden resurrection, and now bulk so largely in the minds of archæologists that their importance is in danger of being exaggerated.

A significant note is added: "Afterwards were the families of the Canaanites scattered abroad." How could this be? Their line of migration and settlement led directly to the great sea, and was hemmed in by that of the Japhetites on the north and of the Cushites on the south; but they made the sea their highway, and soon there was no coast from end to end of the Mediterranean and far along the European and African shores of the Atlantic that was not familiar with the Phœnician Canaanite. But it may be said these Phœnicians were a Semitic people. They certainly spoke a Semitic language allied to the Hebrew, but what right have we to attribute Semitic languages solely to the descendants of the Biblical Shem? Even if these languages originated with them they may have spread to other peoples, as we know they replaced the old Turanian speech of Babylonia, just as the Arabic has extinguished other languages in Egypt itself. In whatever way the Phœnicians acquired a Semitic tongue, in

* Canaan with our old historian is the name of a man, but it came to designate first the "low country" or coast region of Western Palestine and then the whole of Palestine.

† Conder and others call it Turanian.

physical character they were not Semitic, but closely allied to the Hittites, the Philistines, and the people of Mitzor or Egypt. The Egyptian sculptures prove this, and the celebrated Capuan bust of Hannibal reminds us of the features of the old Hyksos kings of Egypt, who were no doubt of Hamite or Turanian stock.

This is a fair summary of the testimony of the writer of Genesis tenth, as compared with the general evidence of history and archæology. But we have something further to learn from what may be called the fossil remains of prehistoric peoples as embodied in the Egyptian monuments, which are conversant with all the nations around the eastern end of the Mediterranean.

The Egyptians divided the nations known to them into four groups, of which they have given us several representations in tombs and public buildings. One of these consisted of their own race. The other three were as follows: (1) Southern peoples mostly of dark complexions, ranging from light brown to black. These included the Cushites, Punites, and negroes. (2) Western peoples mostly of fair complexions inhabiting the islands and northern coasts of the Mediterranean, the "Hanebu" or chiefs of the north or of the isles, with some populations of North Africa, the so-called white Lybians and Maxyans. (3) Northern or northeastern peoples, or those of Syria and the neighboring parts of Western Asia, Amorites, Hittites, Edomites, Arabs, etc., usually represented as of yellowish complexion.

The first of these divisions evidently corresponds with the line of Cushite migration of Genesis, extending from Shinar through Southern Arabia, Nubia, and Ethiopia, and of which the negroes are apparently degraded members pushed in advance of the others, while the populations of Pun and Kesh, the southern Arabians and their relatives in Africa, closely resemble, as figured in the monuments, the Egyptians themselves.

The second group of the Egyptian classification represents those so-called Aryan peoples of Europe and its islands, and parts of Northern Africa, of whom the Greeks are a typical race, and who in Genesis are said to have possessed the "Isles of the Gentiles;" though in the wave of migration from the east they were in many places preceded by non-Aryan races, Pelasgians, Iberians, etc., possibly wandering Hamitic tribes, while they were also invaded by that scattering abroad of the Phœnician Canaanites referred to in Genesis. They are represented in the

monuments as people with European features, fair complexions, and sometimes fair hair and blue eyes.

The third group is the most varied of the whole, because its seat in Syria was a meeting-place of many tribes. Its most ancient members, the Phœnicians and allied nations, were, according to the monuments, men resembling the Egyptian and Cushite type, and these, no doubt, were those pre-Semitic and pre-historic nations of Canaan referred to in the remarkable notes regarding the Emim, Zuzim, etc., in the second chapter of Deuteronomy, which may be regarded as a foot-note to the Toledoth of Genesis tenth. These aborigines were invaded by men of different types. First, we find in the monuments that the Amorites of the Palestine hills were a fair people with somewhat European features like some of the present populations of the Lebanon. When returning over the Lebanon in 1884 we met a large company of men with camels and donkeys carrying merchandise. They were fair-complexioned and with brown hair, and from their features I might have supposed they were Scottish Highlanders. I was told they were Druses, and they were evidently much like, as are indeed many of the modern fellaheen of the Palestine hills, the Amar as they are pictured in Egypt. These white peoples, though reckoned in the Bible as Hamites, may have had a mixture of Aryan blood. It is to be noted here that the Amorite chiefs, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, named as confederate with Abraham, have non-Semitic names.

A later inroad was that of the Hittites, evidently a people having affinity with the Philistines and Egyptians, but whose chiefs and nobles seem to have been of Tartar blood, like the modern Turks. The names of their kings seem also to have been non-Semitic. Later, the great westward migration of Semitic peoples, to which that of Abraham himself belongs, not only introduced the Israelites but many nations of Semitic or mixed blood, the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Ishmaelites, etc., whom we find figuring in the Egyptian monuments as yellow or brownish people with a Jewish style of features, and all of whom, as mentioned above, would be known to the Egyptians and Canaanites as "Hebrews." *

Thus the monuments confirm the Jewish record, and the con-

* This is independent of the question whether we regard the name Eber as that of an ancestor, or merely of men from beyond the Euphrates.

fusion which some ethnologists have introduced into the matter arises from their applying in an arbitrary manner the special tests of physical and philological characteristics, and neglecting to distinguish the primary migrations of men from subsequent intrusions.

Another singular point of agreement is that, just as in Egypt we find men civilized from the first, so we find elsewhere. In Egypt writing and literature date from before the time of Abraham. In like manner we have no monumental evidence of any time when the Accadian people of Babylonia were destitute of writing and science, and we now find that there were learned scribes in all the cities of Canaan, and that the Phœnicians and Southern Arabians knew their alphabet ages before Moses, while even the Greeks seem to have known alphabetic writing long before the Mosaic age.* These men, in short, were descendants of the survivors of the Noachian Deluge, and therefore civilized from the first; and though we have no certain evidence of letters before the flood, except the statement of the author of the Babylonian deluge tablets, that Noah hid written archives at Sippara before going into the ark, yet it is quite certain that men who could build Noah's ship are not unworthy ancestors of the Phœnician seamen, who probably launched their barks on the Mediterranean before the death of Noah himself. Thus whatever value we may attach to the record in Genesis, we cannot refuse to admit that it is thoroughly consistent with itself and with the testimony of the oldest monuments of Asia and Africa, as it is also with the evidence of the geological changes of the Pleistocene and early modern epoch.

In like manner the Egyptian inscriptions of the conquests of Thothmes III. give us a pre-Mosaic record of Palestinian geography corresponding with that of the Hebrew conquest, and the pictures of sieges coincide with the excavations of Petrie at Lachish in restoring those Canaanite towns, "walled up to heaven", which excited the fear of the Israelites. Neither can we scoff at the illiteracy of men who were carrying on diplomatic correspondence in written despatches before Genesis itself was compiled. Nor can we doubt the military prowess of these people, their chariot forces, their sculptured idols and images, their wealth of gold and silver, their agricultural and artistic skill. All these

*Petrie "Illahun, Kahun & Garob," 1891.

are amply proved by the monuments of the Egyptians and the Hittites.*

Palestine thus presents a pre-historic past parallel with the earlier years of Egypt. It has however a still earlier period, for in Palestine we have evidence of the existence of man long before the dispersion of the sons of Noah. To appreciate this evidence, we must go back, as in the case of Egypt, to the pre-human period. All along the coast of Palestine, from Jaffa to the northern limit of old Phœnicia, the geological traveller sees evidence of a recent submergence, in the occurrence of sandstone, gravel, and limestone with shells and other marine remains of species still living in the Mediterranean. These are the relics of that Pleistocene submergence already referred to, in which the Nile Valley was an arm of the sea and Africa was an island. No evidence has been found of the residence of man in Palestine in this period, when, as the sea washed the very bases of the hills, and the plains were under water, it was certainly not very well suited to his abode. The climate was also probably more severe than at present and the glaciers of Lebanon must have extended nearly to the sea. This was the time of the so-called glacial period in Western Europe.

This, however, was succeeded by that post-glacial period in which, as already explained, the area of the Mediterranean was much smaller than at present and the land encroached far upon the bed of the sea. This, the second continental period, is that in which man makes his first undoubted appearance in Europe, and we have evidence of the same kind in Syria.

One of the most interesting localities proving this is the pass of Nahr el Kelb, north of Beyrout, which I had an opportunity in 1884 of studying.† At this place remains of ancient caverns exist, at present 100 feet above the sea level, but which must have been cut by the waves at the time of the Pleistocene depression, and which in the succeeding elevation were probably raised to several hundred feet higher than their present position. In the

*Bliss, in the quarterly statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for April, 1892, figures many interesting objects found in the lower or Amorite stratum of the Mound of Tell el Hesy (Lachisch). We have here a bronze battle axe and heads of javelins that may have been used against the soldiers of Joshua, and axes and pottery of equally early date, along with multitudes of flint flakes, arrow-heads, etc., used at this early time. It is to be hoped that the further exploration of this site may yield yet more interesting results,

†They were previously described in part by Tristram and by Lartet.

stalagmite deposited by the dripping of water in these caves are imbedded multitudes of broken bones and teeth of large animals, and flint flakes used as knives by the aboriginal people.

That the occupancy of these caves is very ancient is proved by the fact that the old Egyptian conquerors, who cut a road for themselves over these precipices before the Exodus, seem to have found them in the same state as at present, while farther south ancient Syrian tombs are excavated in similar bone breccias. But there is better evidence than this. The bones and teeth in these caves belong not to the animals which have inhabited the Lebanon in historic times, but to creatures like the hairy rhinoceros and the bison, now extinct, which could not have lived in this region since the comparatively modern period in which the Mediterranean resumed its dominion over that great plain between Phœnicia and Cyprus, which we know had been submerged long before the first migrations of the Hamites into Phœnicia, even before the entrance of those comparatively rude tribes which seem to have inhabited the country before the Phœnician colonization.* Unfortunately no burials of these early men have yet been found, and perhaps the Lebanon caves were only their summer sojourns on hunting expeditions. They were, however, probably of the same stock with the races (the Cro-Magnon and Canstadt) of the so-called mammoth age in western Europe, who have left similar remains. Thus we can carry man in the Lebanon back to that absolutely prehistoric age which preceded the Noachian Deluge and the dispersion of the Noachidæ. †

If in imagination we suppose ourselves to visit the caves of the Nahr el Kelb pass, when they were inhabited by these early men, we should find them to be tall muscular people, clothed in skins, armed with flint-tipped javelins and flint hatchets, and cooking the animals caught in the chase in the mouths of their caves. They were probably examples of the ruder and less civilized members of that powerful and energetic antediluvian population which had apparently perfected so many arts, and the remains of whose more advanced communities are now buried in the silt of the sea bottom. If we looked out westward on what is now the Mediterranean, we should see a wide wooded or grassy plain as far as eye

* Some of these tribes also lived in caves, as that of Ant Elias, but the animals they consumed are those now living in the Lebanon.

† Dawson, *Trans. Vict. Institute*, May, 1884, also "Modern Science in Bible Lands."

could reach, and perhaps might discern vast herds of elephant, rhinoceros and bison wandering over these plains in their annual migrations. Possibly on the far margin of the land we might see the smoke of antediluvian towns long ago deeply submerged in the sea.

The great diluvial catastrophe, which closed this period and finally introduced the present geographical conditions, is that which we know as the historical deluge, and the old peoples of the age of the mammoth and rhinoceros were antediluvians and must have perished from the earth before the earliest migration of the Beni Noah.

Putting together the results referred to in the preceding pages, we may restore the prehistoric ages of the eastern Mediterranean under the following statements:

1. In the period immediately preceding human occupancy, the land of Palestine, Egypt, and Arabia participated in the great pleistocene depression, accompanied by a rigorous climate.

2. The next stage was one of continental elevation, in which the borders of the Mediterranean were dry land, and vast plains in this basin, and even in the western Atlantic, were open to human migration. In this age palæocosmic men took up their abode all over western Asia, Europe, and northern Africa, and probably occupied broad lands since submerged. At this period the region was inhabited by the mammoth, rhinoceros, bison, and other large animals now altogether or locally extinct.

3. This age was terminated by a great submergence, accompanied with vast destruction of animal and human life, and of comparatively short duration, corresponding to the historical deluge.

4. From this depression the more limited continents of the modern period were elevated, and man again overspread them from his primitive seats in the Euphratean region, as recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis.

5. In this early migration the Biblical Hamites, forming one of the groups of men vaguely known as Turanian, first spread themselves over Palestine and Egypt, and founded the early Phœnician, Canaanite, Mizraimite, and Cushite tribes and nations.

6. In early historic times Semitic peoples, Hebrews and others, from the East, and Mongoloid peoples from the North, migrated into Palestine and dominated and mixed with the primitive tribes, finally penetrating into Egypt and establishing there the dominion

known as that of the Hyksos. The historical Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, and Hittites were peoples of this character, having a substratum of Hamite blood with aristocracies of Semitic or Tartar origin.

In looking back over the preceding pages I find that I have dilated at some length on a few points and have merely glanced at others, perhaps equally important, while the space at command has been insufficient to enable me to present much evidence that might have been adduced. I believe, however, that the conclusions advanced are correct up to the present state of knowledge, and that the tendency of discovery is to confirm and extend them.

It will be observed that while archaeological evidence tends to illustrate and corroborate that wonderful collection of early historical documents contained in the Book of Genesis, and to prove their great antiquity, on the other hand these documents prove to be the most precious sources of information as to the antediluvian age, the great flood, the earliest dispersion of men, the old Nimrodic empire, the connections of Asiatic and African civilization, and other matters connected with the origins of the oldest nations, respecting which we have little other written history.

We thus learn that, relatively to Bible history, there is no prehistoric age, since it carries us back beyond the deluge to the origin of man, so that we might properly restrict this term in its narrower signification to those parts of the world not covered by this primitive history. It is true that a tide of criticism hostile to the integrity of Genesis has been rising for some years ; but it seems to beat vainly against a solid rock, and the ebb has now evidently set in. The battle of historical and linguistic criticism may indeed rage for a time over the history and date of the Mosaic law, but in so far as Genesis is concerned it has been practically decided by scientific exploration.

Professor Sayce, one of the best authorities on these subjects, well remarks in a recent paper:* "The time has now come for confronting the conclusions of the 'higher criticism,' so far as it applies to the books of the Old Testament, with the ascertained results of modern oriental research. The amount of certain knowledge now possessed by the Egyptologist and Assyriologist would be surprising to those who are not specialists

* *Expository Times*, October, 1891.

in these branches, while the discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets (and we may add the geological and topographical facts daily accumulating) have poured a flood of light upon the ancient world which is at once startling and revolutionary. As in the case of Greek history, so too in the case of Israelitish history, the time of critical demolition is at an end, and it is time for the archæologist to restore the fallen edifice." Or perhaps we should rather say—the edifice has not fallen, but merely requires the removal of the learned rubbish in which it has been buried, in order to restore its pristine utility and beauty.

Since writing the preceding pages I have met with a remarkable paper by Mr. Horatio Hale, in the "*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada.*"* It is one which should commend itself to the study of every Biblical scholar and archæologist; but is contained in a periodical which perhaps meets the eyes of few of them. In this paper he maintains the importance of language as a ground of anthropological classification, and then uses his wide knowledge of the languages of American aborigines, and other rude races, to show that the grammatical complexity and logical perfection of these languages implies a high intellectual capacity in their original framers, and that where such complex and perfect languages are spoken by very rude tribes like the Australian aborigines, they originated with cultivated and intellectual peoples,—in the case of the Australian, with the civilized primitive Dravidians of India. He thus shows that languages, like alphabets, have undergone a process of degradation, so that those of modern times are less perfect exponents of thought than those which preceded them, and that primitive man in his earliest state must have been endowed with as high intellectual powers as any of his descendants.

On similar grounds he shows that it is not in the outlying barbarous races that we are to look for truly primitive man, since here we have merely degraded types, and that the primitive centres of man and language must have been in the old historic lands of Western Asia and Northern Africa. On this view the time necessary for the development of the arts of civilization and of extensive colonization would not be great. "In five centuries a single human pair planted in a fertile oasis might have given origin to a people of five hundred thousand souls, numerous

* Vol. IX., Section II., 1891.

enough to have sent out emigrations to the nearest inviting lands." The same lapse of time would have sufficed to develop agriculture, to domesticate animals, and to make some progress in architectural and other arts of life. He quotes the remarkable passage of Reclus* as to the agency of woman in the inventions of early art, and shows that this accords with more modern experience among the less civilized nations. It is obvious that all this tends to bring scientific anthropology into the closest relation with the old Biblical history, though Hale, in deference, perhaps, to modern prejudices, does not refer to this.

In the passage quoted by Hale, Reclus says: "It is to woman that mankind owes all that has made us men." Following this hint of the ingenious French writer, we may imagine the first man and woman inhabiting some fertile region, rich in fruits and other natural products, and subsisting at first on the uncultivated bounty of nature. With the birth of their first child, perhaps before, would come the need of shelter either in some dry cavern or booth of poles and leaves or bark, carpeted perhaps with moss or boughs of pine. This would be the first "home," with the woman for its housekeeper. We may imagine the man bringing to it the lamb or kid whose dam he had killed, and the woman, with motherly instinct, pitying the little orphan and training it to be a domestic pet, the first of tamed animals. She, too, would store grain, seeds and berries for domestic use, and some of these germinating would produce patches of grain, or shrubs, or fruit trees around the hut. Noticing these and protecting them, she would be the first gardener and orchardist. The woman and her children might add to the cultivated plants or domesticated quadrupeds and birds; and the man would be induced, in the intervals of hunting and fishing, to guard, protect and fence them.

When the boys grew up, to one of them might be assigned the care of the sheep and goats, to the other the culture of the little farm, while they might aid their father in erecting a better and more artistic habitation, the first attempt at architecture, and in introducing artificial irrigation to render their field more fertile. Is not this little romance of M. Elie Reclus perfectly in harmony with the old familiar story in Genesis, and also with the most recent results of modern science?

J. William Dawson.

*"Primitive Folk" (Contemporary Science Series), p. 58.

THE USE OF CATHEDRALS.

BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

PEOPLE sometimes ask, Of what use are cathedrals? Why expend a large sum in erecting a magnificent building, and in endowing those who are to minister in it, when the same amount of money might erect a number of churches where they are much wanted, and at the same time make provision for the clergymen who would be placed in charge of them? I wish to answer this question.

In doing so, it is desirable to distinguish between the advantages which the building brings along with it and the benefits to be derived by the clerics who are placed in charge of it from the position secured by the cathedral. The cathedral itself has practically furthered the same great end in every age of the church, only such changes being required as the alterations in the musical and æsthetic taste of the day may suggest, whilst the duties of its guardians demand much more extended and thoughtful adaptation to the wants of the time. In England cathedrals have suffered seriously in the past from its being taken for granted that the requirements for members of the chapters are as completely crystallized as are the demands for the services to be celebrated within the cathedral walls.

It may be well to speak first of the benefits to be derived from the building itself, and the kind of service which the existence of such a building demands. In speaking of a cathedral I wish it to be understood that I am not thinking of makeshift buildings which are sometimes called by that name, and which may have their use for a time of transition and preparation for something better, but of cathedrals such as are found in England and on the continent, which are amongst the most beautiful, if they are not the most beautiful specimens of architecture to be found upon earth.

It is obvious that the existence of such a building adds dignity and external importance to the religious body to which it belongs. It speaks of artistic skill, devotion, and the interests of religion and self-sacrifice ; it seems to recognize the warning contained in the message to God's first people in Haggai (I., 4.): "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house lie waste." For when private houses are magnificent and the churches are mean, it seems as though what pertained to this life was everything, and that which was to help and prepare for the next were nothing ; and though it is quite true that the Almighty dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and despiseth not the poorest and simplest structure when that is all that the worshippers can offer, it is quite another thing when nothing is too good or costly that is intended for self, nothing too cheap or unbecoming that is designed for the worship of God.

The advantage just named is not the only one derived from a stately building. We are all influenced, often involuntarily, by our surroundings. We learn to be reverent when those around us are reverent. We are assisted in lifting up our hearts to Heaven when we see others showing their sense of the value and importance of what appertains to the preparation for a home there, by making costly sacrifice to help them to realize it; when we are invited to join in services which exceed in beauty and devotional feeling anything that is to be found elsewhere. Moreover, it is no slight advantage for an historic church to show by outward credentials its connection with the past ages in which it has existed. Then a cathedral is diocesan, not parochial ; it is the seat of the bishop, and in times of excitement, when party spirit is apt to find a place even in clerical circles, it is a neutral ground where all can meet without feeling compromised, which would not be the case if those called upon to take part in an ecclesiastical gathering were assembled in a church whose members took a prominent part on one side or the other. Moreover, the greater size of a cathedral permits much larger numbers to meet within its walls. In some of our English cathedrals important synods have been held, whilst in St. Paul's, London, the nation by its representatives has seemed to be gathered to return thanks for some memorable triumph over their enemies, as during the Wars of the Roses and the wars on the continent, when in the reigns of Queen Anne and George II. signal victories were won. Besides this there

have been held within the same solemn walls such solemn thanksgivings as when George III. recovered from the distressing malady with which he was visited, and more recently when the present Prince of Wales was restored to health after his life had been all but despaired of.

This suggests the next great benefit a cathedral ought to confer, to which I would call attention. Its services ought to present a standard of excellence to the diocese. The musical arrangements ought to be superior to what can be found elsewhere, and the best preachers in the diocese should be heard from its pulpit. The teaching of music, and especially of singing, has become much more popular among the English-speaking races than it used to be. Comparatively few children are allowed to grow up without some instruction in singing, and consequently there is a much greater demand for good music than there used to be. It would be a discredit to those responsible for the religious education of the people if all the good music of the country were to be found in secular assemblies, at the opera, or at concerts, and none of it were dedicated to the service of Almighty God. Parish churches, at all events in England, are seldom able to provide the most perfect musical services: these should be looked for in cathedrals, which thus come to be looked upon as centres from which there proceeds a stimulating power to elevate the musical arrangements of churches within their limits. Moreover, if from time to time the choirs of the various churches were gathered within the cathedral walls for choral festivals or other great occasions, they would be encouraged to make greater efforts for improvement and would be assisted in doing so. Then practical improvement will be found to go hand in hand with advance in the theory and science of music. Genius is encouraged to take bolder flights and to make greater efforts when there is a certainty of sympathetic supporters; whilst, in the absence of these, it can scarcely be expected that great musical composers will appear. It is also to be expected that the character of the popular music will be more reverent and restrained when it is nurtured by ecclesiastical assemblies than when it is under the sole control of gatherings of a different kind.

The benefits conferred by cathedrals of which I have hitherto spoken are, or ought to be, common to all ages of the church. Of course the manner in which the services are celebrated will vary

from time to time in accordance with the prevalent feeling of the age; but there will be much greater and more fundamental differences in the kind of work required from the officers of the cathedral. For some time these glorious buildings in England, and possibly elsewhere, were not valued as they ought to be, because there had been no readjustment of the duties required from those placed in charge of them. The original responsibilities of the prebendaries had been materially altered. Instead of being required to preach the gospel to a still heathen people living upon or near to their prebends, or upon the estates of the dean and chapter, they were comfortably beneficed wherever some good patron had placed them; whilst the residentiary canons had ceased to give exclusive attention to the incessant round of services in the cathedral, which at one time prevailed, and spent the larger portion of each year on some pleasant cure which they held with their canonry. The consequence was that there was a low, crystallized view of the duties of members of cathedral bodies in England, the dignified positions they occupied being regarded by those holding them as little more than sinecures; and those who had the bestowing of such positions not infrequently still further favored them by nominating to them men who were incapable of raising their religious tone or influence. What ought to have been done was to adapt the work of the dean and canons to the requirements of the time, which would have been done if patrons and clergy had seriously considered what was best for the church, and had thought less of their own convenience.

In all projects for reviving cathedral life, or establishing a cathedral system, it is a matter of the utmost importance to determine in what way the deans and canons can be made most useful in elevating the religious standard of the diocese, in furthering the development of its institutions, and in keeping in vigorous life the various organizations which are at work in the different parishes. The weakness of the parochial system is that it has a tendency to foster the feeling in the heart of each incumbent that his parish is the church, that its wants are all-important, those that are outside it are of secondary moment; and whilst his energies are concentrated with self-denying force upon ministering to whatever may tend to its spiritual or temporal improvement, there is less care and interest than there ought to be for the other parts of the same spiritual body. No doubt this is

partly a natural feeling arising from the interest which every learned man takes in his own work, but it is fostered to a great degree by the isolation in which the clergy often find themselves. The cathedral is to the diocese what the heart is to the body, and as the stream of life wells forth from the heart to the extremities, so from the cathedral a stream of living influence and power should flow to every parish in the diocese. The bishop, from his seat of authority, has to order and govern the diocese; the dean and the canons from their position should be his fellow helpers by being channels of influence and friendly advisers of the parochial clergy and coöperators with them.

It may be well to mention some of the methods in which they can carry out this object. They can make the cathedral the seat of a school for educating young men for holy orders. At Wells, at Ely, and at Salisbury this good work is being carried on in England, and the future candidates for ordination are being trained under the elevating influence of the cathedral services, and under the very eye of the bishop, thus giving him the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with them and directing their studies before they assume the responsible duties of the clerical life. Another work which the cathedral staff can perform is that of preaching in the various churches of the diocese. It is no small help to the clergyman who has to preach to the same congregation Sunday after Sunday, and to the people who listen to him, to have now and then a dignitary from the cathedral take his place; it is a new stream of life coming amongst them. The cathedral dignitary may not be a more eloquent preacher than their own clergyman, but it seems to add strength to his teaching when some one holding an important position in the diocese preaches to them the same great truths from a somewhat different point of view, as always must be the case when different men seek to inculcate the same doctrines. Then, at the present day, missions to promote advance in the spiritual life on the part of the religious, and to arouse the careless and indifferent to serious thought, are happily becoming frequent. The difficulty not infrequently is to find the man capable of undertaking such work with effect. One canon of the cathedral might be selected for this special duty. Moreover, such help would bring the clergy more closely into connection with other parts of the diocese and tend to diminish that isolated feeling of which I

have spoken. Besides this, the visitor from the cathedral might be able to suggest plans for parochial improvement, or to further those suggested by the bishop, giving those plans more weight with the laity than they would have if the people worked upon the unsupported voice of the clergyman of the parish. Besides this, there are times when the local incumbent is sick or apathetic, or when there is a change of ministers, when it is most desirable that the charge of the parish should be placed in responsible hands, so that the various kinds of parochial organization may not slide into a lower condition of efficiency, as too often happens during a vacancy.

There is another and most important duty that members of the cathedral staff may be expected to discharge. Amongst them there should be some who can dedicate their whole time to study and theological learning. In an age like the present when there are so many distractions, so many crude attempts to weaken articles of faith, so many theories started to lead men astray, so many doubts raised as to the authorities on which received doctrines rest, it is most desirable that there should be some able men with sufficient leisure to examine the speculations set forth, and to controvert that which needs opposing. And it is well to bear in mind that with the ill-instructed or the half-instructed the words of men sitting in seats of authority have a weight not accorded to those devoid of such a position.

There is yet another class of duties which I have left to the last. The bishop needs some men upon whom he can rely to carry out the works of organization which he seeks to maintain or to establish. Too often this work has to be performed by earnest men who are compelled to neglect some of their own special duties in order to accomplish what has to be done. If there were members of the cathedral staff on whom the bishop could rely this would not be. He would be able to accomplish much that is now left undone, to perfect much that is now unsatisfactorily done, and to further plans for the spiritual improvement of his diocese which he is now obliged to leave unattempted for want of suitable instruments wherewith to attempt it.

To make the improvement suggested two things are essential. The first is to choose the right men for cathedral offices. In England it has too often happened that the cathedrals have failed to do any good work they might otherwise accomplish, because un-

suitable men have been promoted to their chief seats. There needs to be a power to decide what the work shall be that each officer shall be expected to discharge, and to see that the person selected shall possess the necessary aptitude to perform such work ably and efficiently. It might be well if cathedral appointments were sometimes treated as staff appointments in other services are, *i.e.*, that their occupants should be nominated for a term of years, and at the expiration of that term the nominators should be free to appoint some one else, or to extend the tenure of the existing occupant; whilst for the dispossessed dean or canon some parochial charge for which he is more suited might be found.

A second requirement is that the cathedral shall be sufficiently endowed. Popular favor is apt to be capricious. And if the musical services are to be raised to a high state of efficiency, they must be costly; it would be impossible to depend upon volunteers, whilst the independence of the chief officers and much of the good work that should be performed by them would be seriously hindered, if not marred, if one of their duties were to raise the necessary funds for their own maintenance. In saying this I seek to point out what should be the aim and intention of those who aim to extend cathedral institutions. Such great works cannot be accomplished in one generation. Most of our English cathedrals took centuries to complete; and even in the present day, when there is so much more rapidity in men's movements, it cannot be expected, nor is it desirable, that there should be suddenly a complete revolution. It is therefore given to us to rejoice over what is being done to found cathedrals, whilst at the same time we refuse to regard the work as complete until endowments are provided as well as buildings,—until there is a perfect arrangement of the duties and work of those who are to bear office in them, as well as an arrangement as to the appointment of men to fill such offices, and at the same time a power provided somewhere for adapting their work to the special and changing wants of the time.

ROBERT GREGORY.

ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE CAMPAIGN.

BY SAMUEL GOMPERS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

It is with some trepidation that I begin writing this article, for while it may be true that I have as good opportunities as any other man in the country of conjecturing the probable action of the workingmen of America, and particularly those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in the coming Presidential campaign, I am certain that my article will please but very few. I have had to say and write some things in my more than twenty-five years' connection with the labor movement for which I have incurred the displeasure of some very earnest, though, in my opinion, mistaken men who differ with our movement and myself, as one of its representatives, as to methods, but not as to the ultimate end and aim of the social, economic and political struggle of the toiling masses.

I feel sure that this production will in nowise tend to lessen this difference of opinion, but if it will tend to give a clearer understanding to a number of friends and foes as to what the trade unions really are ; that their methods are within the range of reason ; that their work is being crowned with success as far as conditions will permit ; that they are the natural organization of the wage-earning masses ; and that it is their mission to secure the amelioration as well as the emancipation of labor—then I shall feel my conscience eased, and be amply rewarded, in venturing to write an article upon the probable action of the American Federation of Labor in the coming Presidential campaign.

Why should its attitude be different in the coming Presidential campaign from what it has been in the past ? In what way does the coming campaign differ from those of 1876, 1880, 1884 or 1888 ? Is there any particular principle involved in the

party issues in which the wage-workers have a deep or keen interest? There is indeed none.

Was there any real improvement or deterioration in the condition of the working people, as a result of the changes, when Mr. Cleveland succeeded the late Mr. Arthur, or when Mr. Harrison succeeded Mr. Cleveland? I think not, and I feel satisfied that I will not lose my reputation as a "prophet" if I venture to predict that, so far as the wage-workers are concerned, it will matter little if President Harrison or some other Republican on the one side, or any member of the Democratic party on the other, should be elected to succeed the present incumbent, or even should the People's Party succeed (though I doubt that they even entertain the belief that they will succeed) in electing their candidate to the Presidency.

The members of the organizations affiliated with the Federation will no doubt, in a large measure, as citizens, vote for the candidate of the party of their own political predilections. But the number is ever on the increase who disenthral themselves from partisan voting and exercise their franchise to reward or chastise those parties and candidates, that deserve either their friendship or resentment. With us it is not a question of parties or men; it is a question of measures.

That there exists a feeling of dissatisfaction with, and bitter antagonism to, both the Republican and Democratic parties is not to be gainsaid. Broken promises to labor, insincere, half-hearted support and even antagonism of legislation in the interest of the toilers on the one hand, and the alacrity and devotion with which the interests of the corporations and the wealth-possessing class are nurtured, protected and advanced on the other, have had their effect, and the result is that many toilers have forever severed their connection with the old parties. That the number will continue to grow larger year by year I have not the slightest doubt. To me this party defection of the wage-workers is one of the signs of the dawn of a healthier public opinion, a sturdier manhood and independence, and a promise to maintain the liberties that the people now enjoy, as well as to ever struggle on to attain that happy goal towards which, throughout its entire history, the human family have been perpetually pushing forward.

But in leaving the old parties, to whom, to what shall former

Democratic or Republican workmen turn? To the People's Party? Are such changes and improvements promised there that the workers can with any degree of assurance throw in their political fortunes with that party? Of course, acting upon the principle "of all evils choose the least," they will more generally coöperate with the People's Party than with any similar party heretofore gracing the Presidential political arena.

As a matter of fact, however, to support the People's Party under the belief that it is a *labor* party is to act under misapprehension. It is not and cannot, in the nature of its make-up, be a labor party, or even one in which the wage-workers will find their haven. Composed, as the People's Party is, mainly of *employing* farmers without any regard to the interests of the *employed* farmers of the country districts or the mechanics and laborers of the industrial centres, there must of necessity be a divergence of purposes, methods, and interests.

In speaking thus frankly of the composition of the People's Party there is no desire to belittle the efforts of its members, or even to withhold the sympathy due them in their agitation to remedy the wrongs which they suffer from corporate power and avarice; on the contrary, the fullest measure of sympathy and all possible encouragement should and will be given them; for they are doing excellent work in directing public attention to the dangers which threaten the body politic of the republic. But, returning to the consideration of the entire coöperation or amalgamation of the wage-workers' organizations with the People's Party, I am persuaded that all who are more than superficial observers, or who are keen students of the past struggles of the proletariat of all countries, will with one accord unite in declaring the union impossible, because it is unnatural. Let me add that, before there can be any hope of the unification of labor's forces of the field, farm, factory, and workshop, the people who work on and in them for wages must be organized to protect *their* interests against those who pay them wages for that work.

Then, if as an organization, the American Federation of Labor will take no official part in the coming Presidential campaign of a partizan character, it may, with a fair degree of reason, be asked what we will do? Some have asked whether we will have a candidate of our own in the field. I can answer both by saying that, apart from the acts already referred to above, we shall maintain as

a body a masterly inactivity. As organized trade-unionists, we have had some experience with a Presidential candidate, and in campaigns of our own, the lessons of which have not been forgotten by us.

It may not be generally known that in 1872 the organized workingmen of the country placed a candidate in nomination for the Presidency of the United States. The National Labor Union, the immediate predecessor and parent of the Federation, at its convention of that year, held in Columbus, O., selected the late David Davis, of Illinois, as its standard bearer. So far as the nomination was concerned, quite a degree of success was attained. A candidate was placed in the field, but it was at the cost of the life of the organization. Another convention of the National Labor Union was never held after that. Indeed, so great was the reaction among the organized workingmen against this departure, and so thoroughly had they lost confidence in a general organization of a national character, that, despite all efforts to induce them to be represented in a national convention, defeat and disappointment were the result until 1881, when the Federation was called into existence.

Since its organization the American Federation of Labor has kept in mind two facts: first, the lamentable experience of its predecessor; and second, that, in the struggle for improved conditions and emancipation for the toilers, what is wanted is the organization of the wage-workers, not on "party" lines, but on the lines of their class interests.

As an organization, the American Federation of Labor is not in harmony either with the existing or projected political parties. So deep-seated is the conviction in this matter that, long ago, it was decided to hold the conventions of the Federation *after* the elections. Thus freed from party bias and campaign crimination, these gatherings have been in a position to declare for general principles, and to judge impartially upon the merits or demerits of each party, holding each to an accountability for its perfidy to the promises made to the working people, and at the same time keeping clear and distinct the economic character of the organization. By our non-political partisan character as an organization, we tacitly declare that political liberty with economic independence is illusory and deceptive, and that only in so far as we gain economic independence can our political liberty become tangible and

important. This may sound like political heresy, but it is economic truth.

As time goes on we discern that the organized workingmen place less reliance upon the help offered by others, and it is a spark upon the altar of progress that they have learned to more firmly depend upon their own efforts to secure those changes and improvements which are theirs by right.

Of course it must not be imagined that we have no interest in the political affairs of our country; on the contrary, we believe that it is our mission to gather the vast numbers of the wealth-producers, agricultural, industrial, and commercial, into a grand army of organized labor, and, by our struggles for improved conditions and emancipation, instil into the minds of the workers a keener appreciation of their true position in society and of their economic, political and social duties and rights as citizens and workers. Every advantage gained in the economic condition of the wage-workers must necessarily have its political and social effect, not only upon themselves but upon the whole people. Hence for the present, at least, nearly all our efforts are concentrated upon the field as indicated above.

Many may find fault in our refraining from directly entering the political arena by the nomination of candidates for national and State offices and will point to results in England and other countries for our emulation. In considering this question it must be borne in mind that the *bona-fide* labor movement, as expressed in the trades-unions of America, is much younger, both in years and experience, than it is abroad, and that the element of time is an important factor for the rank and file to mature that confidence in the wisdom and honesty of their leaders, which is as necessary a pre-requisite to the party entering the field of politics, as it has been in that of economics.

Whatever has been gained for the toilers in our country has been the achievement of the trades-unions, and it would be most unwise, not to say anything harsher, to abandon the organization, position and methods of past success to fly "to others we know not of." More than half of the battle of labor has already been won. No really intelligent man to-day disputes the claims of labor. The stage of ridicule is happily past; the era of reason has taken its place; and what is now needed is the means and the power to enforce our claim. To that end we are marshalling

our forces, and we will demonstrate to the world that the demands and struggles of the toiling masses, while ostensibly and immediately concerned with their own improvement and emancipation, will develop the possibilities, grandeur and true nobility of the human family.

Having mapped out our course, the members of the American Federation of Labor can look on the coming Presidential campaign with a degree of equanimity not often attained by the average citizen. The excitement and turmoil, criminations and recriminations will not rend our organization asunder, as it has done so many others; and during it all, and when the blare of trumpets has died away, and the "spell-binders" have received their rewards, the American Federation of Labor will still be found plodding along, doing noble battle in the struggle for the uplifting of the toiling masses.

SAMUEL GOMPERS.

GAMBLING AND CHEATING IN ANCIENT ROME.

BY RODOLFO LANCIANI, PROFESSOR OF ARCHÆOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ROME.

IN THE spring of 1876, during the construction of the Via Volturno, near the Prætorian camp, a Roman tavern was discovered, containing, besides many hundred *amphoræ*, the "sign" of the establishment, engraved on a marble slab. Here it is :

ABEMVS INCENA
PVLLVM PISCEM
PERNAM PAONEM
BENA TORES

The meaning of the sign is double ; it tells the customers that a good supper was always ready within, and that the gaming tables were always open to gamblers. The sign, in fact, is a *tabula lusoria* in itself, as shown by the characteristic arrangement of the thirty-six letters, in three lines and six groups of six letters each. Orthography has been freely sacrificed to this arrangement (*abemus* standing for *habemus*, *cena* for *cenam*). The last word of the fourth line shows that the men who patronized the establishment were the *Venatores immunes*, a special troop of Prætorians, into whose custody the *vivarium* of wild beasts, and the *amphitheatrum castrense* were given.

So intense was the love of the Roman for games of hazard, that wherever I have excavated the pavement of a portico, of a basilica, of a bath, or any flat surface accessible to the public, I have always found gaming tables engraved or scratched on the marble or stone slabs, for the amusement of idle men, always ready to cheat each other out of their money.

The evidence of this fact is to be found in the Forum, in the Basilica Julia, in the corridors of the Coliseum, on the steps of the temple of Venus and Rome, in the square in front of the Portico of the Twelve Gods, and even in the House of the Vestals after its secularization in 393. Gaming tables are especially abundant in barracks, such as those of the seventh battalion of *vigiles* near by S. Critogono, and of the police at Ostia and Porto, and of the Roman encampment near Guise in the Department of the Aisne. Sometimes when the camp was moved from place to place, or else from Italy to the frontiers of the empire, the men would not hesitate to carry the heavy tables with their luggage. Two, of pure Roman make, have been discovered at Rusicade in Numidia and at Aïn-Kebira in Mauretania. Naturally enough they could not be wanting in the Prætorian camp, and in the taverns patronized by its turbulent garrison, where the time was spent in revelling and gambling and in riots ending in fights and bloodshed. To these scenes of violence often refer the wording of the tables: such as

LEVATE	LVDERE
NESCIS	DALVSO
RILOCV	RECEDE

"Get up! You know nothing about the game; make room for better players!" Two paintings were discovered in November, 1876, in a tavern at Pompeii, in one of which are seen two players seated on stools opposite each other, and holding on their knees the gaming-table, upon which are arranged in various lines several *latrunculi* of various colors, yellow, black, and white. The man on the left shakes a yellow dice box, and exclaims "EXSI" ("I am out!"). The other one points to the dice, and answers "NON TRIA, DVAS EST" ("Not three points, but two!"). In the next picture the same individuals have sprung to their feet and show fight. The younger says "Not two, but three: I have the game!" whereupon the other man, after flinging at him the grossest insult, repeats his assertion "EGO FVI." The altercation ends with the appearance of the tavern-keeper, who pushes both men into the street and exclaims "ITIS FORIS RIXSATIS" ("Go out of my shop if you want to fight!"). We may assume as a fact that taverns were frequented more for the facility they offered for heavy gambling, in spite of official prohibition,

than for their specialties in wine and food. Mercury was worshipped in those dens more than Bacchus. Here is a sign of another "osteria" discovered at Lyons by Spon:

"Here Mercury promises you gain, Apollo health, and Septumanus [a local god] good fare and a good bed."

The one hundred and more tables already found in Rome, mostly in my life time, belong to six different games of hazard; in some of them, however, the mere chance of dice-throwing was coupled with a certain amount of skill in moving the "men" or *tesserœ*. Their outline is always the same. There are three horizontal lines at an equal distance, each line containing twelve signs, thirty-six in all. The signs vary in almost every table; there are circles, squares, vertical bars, leaves, letters, monograms, crosses, crescents, and immodest symbols; the majority of these tables (sixty-five) contain words arranged so as to make a full sentence with the thirty-six letters. These sentences speak of the fortune, and good or bad luck of the game, of the skill and pluck of the players, of the favor or hostility of bystanders and betting men. Sometimes they invite you to try the seduction of gambling, sometimes they warn you of the risks you incur.

Here are a few examples: On a table found in the catacombs of Callixtus: "If you have a chance in your favor, I shall win by skill." On a table found in the catacombs of Cyriaca: "The circus is full: the clamor is great: Eugene, do win." In the pavement of the Basilica Julia: "If you lose, you cry; if you gain, you exult."

The table is divided into two sides by a middle line, each half being allotted to one of the partners, and the points of each being marked on the section on the right.

The number of dice used was three, being marked with a minimum of one and a maximum of six spots. The most fortunate throw, called *Venereus* by Cicero (de Divin., I., 13) and *basilicus* by Plautus (Curculio II., 3,79) was when the dice showed three *seniones* or 18 spots. The progress of the game was marked on the board by the movement of the men (*latrunculi*) backwards and forwards. The gravity of the losses depended naturally upon the amount of money at stake and the fines that were paid when the dice showed one or more aces. It is difficult to explain what skill had to do with such a game, still Isidorus describes how inveterate gamblers could succeed in

throwing the six and in avoiding the unit. I suspect that this skill was not always innocent, and that a heavy particle of lead was, perhaps, concealed on the side of the unit. In a *graffito* at Pompeii, an honest player congratulates himself for having gained a good sum of money without fraud. Plautus dwells sometimes on these dishonest practices, to avoid which several instruments were invented from time to time, such as the horn (*pyxis cornea*) and the *fritillus*. It seems, however, that these instruments did not always fulfil their purpose. A third one was consequently invented, in the shape of a tower, with a spiral staircase inside and a funnel on the top. The dice shaken first in the horn, or in the *fritillus*, were thrown into the funnel and rolled down the spiral staircase until they landed on the table. Such precautions rendered cheating almost impossible.

Children were initiated into the seductions of gambling (*alea*), by playing "nuts," a pastime cherished also by elder people. So strong, in fact, was the passion for nut gambling, and so heavy were the losses of many gamblers, that special laws were passed from time to time, by which the popular sport was declared a punishable offence, except in the days of the *Saturnalia*. Hence the name of *saturnaliciæ* given to the nuts used in these exceptional days. It was customary to send them as a present, to exchange them among friends, or to carry them about when visiting in suburban villas and country houses. Thus Martial writes to Juvenal (Epigr. VII., 91):

De nostro, facunde, tibi. Juvenalis agello
Saturnalitias mittimus, ecce, nuces.

In the spring of 1878, a life-size statuette of a boy playing at nuts, was discovered in the cemetery of the Agro Verano, near S. Lorenzo *fuori le mura*. The statuette, cut in Pentelic marble, represents the young gambler, leaning forward, as if he had thrown or was about to throw the nut; and his countenance shows anxiety and uncertainty as to the success of his trial. This rare work of art has been illustrated by Countess Ersilia Lovatelli-Caetani in an admirable paper, published in 1882 in the *Bullettino Archeologico Comunale*. Another classical recollection of the popular pastime was discovered seven years ago in the garden of Cavaliere Bertone, near the mausoleum of Lucilia Polla on the Via Salaria. It consists of an epitaph engraved on marble, describing how a certain freedman had been buried, "AD NVCEM,"

that is to say, in the vicinity of an *osteria* called *ad nucem*, from the heavy nut gambling in which its customers were allowed to indulge.

Nuts appear also in wedding ceremonies. The groom used to throw a handful of them among the young men assembled outside the door of the nuptial room to sing the joyous epithalamium; as if wishing to declare that he was leaving forever the follies and thoughtless pleasures of youth. They were also thought to possess virtue in repelling the evil eye, both from the living and the dead. In the farms of *La Marranella*, on the right of the Via Prænestina, Prince del Drago discovered ten years ago a coffin with three nuts placed by the side of the corpse, as a safeguard against an evil influence, just as a Neapolitan of our days would use a horn of red coral. In another tomb discovered at Sienna the deceased had been laid to rest with a string of nuts around her neck.

The game could be played in many ways. One way, still popular among Italian boys, was to make a pyramidal "castle" with four nuts, three at the base and one at the top, and then to try and knock it down with the fifth nut thrown from a certain distance. The game is represented in two ancient bas-reliefs, one discovered at Ostia and illustrated by Gerhard, the second discovered in Rome and illustrated by Melchiorri. The second way of playing was to design a triangle on the floor with chalk, subdividing it into several compartments by means of lines parallel with the base; the winnings were regulated according to the compartment in which the nut fell and remained. Italian boys are still very fond of this game, which they call *campana*, because the figure designed on the floor has the shape of a bell: it is played with coppers.

There was a third system, in which the players placed their stakes (nuts, which had a value like counters of the present day) in a vase with a large opening. The one who succeeded first in throwing his missile inside the jar would gain its contents. To Lucius Verus, one of the heaviest gamblers of old times, is attributed a new variety, which consisted in breaking the vase with a copper coin thrown from a considerable distance. The Emperor Gallienus substituted apples for nuts; *de pomis castella composuit*, as his biographer says.

Not very different from the chance of *pair* and *impair* was the

one of betting on which side a piece of money, thrown up in the air, would come down. The Greeks used for this game a shell, black on one side, white on the other, and called it *νὺξ ἢ ἡμέρα*. The Latins used a copper (*as*), with the head of Janus on one face and the prow of a galley on the other, calling it *capita aut navim*. Our Italian boys call it *arma e santo, testa e croce, Marco e Madonna*, according to the emblems of coinage peculiar to the old states of the peninsula. Cheating was possible also in this game of heads and tails. I have had in my hands a coin of Nero, which had been saw n in two, an uneven piece of iron placed between, and the two halves readjusted so that the coin was sure of falling on the same side on each throw.

These social games, and others, the description of which will be easily found in the works of Becker, Marquardt, Hermann, Becq de Fouquières, Ficoroni, etc., first contrived as a simple pastime, became in progress of time a most pernicious mania. Magistrates tried to interfere, with little or no success. Games in which room was left for a display of skill were put aside and forgotten in fashionable circles, and *alea* reigned alone.

It is refreshing to read of the pleasant way in which Augustus used to play. He was not afraid to be called a gambler, and played simply, honestly, openly, for the real pleasure of it, even in his old age, not only in the month of December, in which it was lawful to do it, during the week of the Saturnalia, but also on other feast-days all through the year. We have the account of one of these festive sittings, given by Augustus himself, which I quote: "We have passed, my dear Tiberius, the *quinquatrus*, [the anniversary feast of Minerva, beginning on the nineteenth of March and lasting five days] in great merriment, gambling every day and warming up to the occasion. Your brother distinguished himself by the great noise he made, and, after all, he did not lose very much, for fortune turned in his favor just when he was approaching ruination. I have lost thirty thousand sesterces, because, as usual, I was very liberal towards my guests and partners. Had I taken from them all that was due to me, and had I been more careful in offering money right and left, I would have cleared at least fifty thousand."

The hospitality of Augustus was so considerate in every way that a sum of money was distributed daily among his guests to help them put up their stakes. So he writes to Julia: "I have

sent you two hundred and fifty sesterces, which represent the amount offered to my guests in case they wished to try their chance at pair and impair."

There were, however, very few gentlemen in Rome ready to imitate the disinterestedness and moderation of their sovereign. The establishment of an imperial court hastened the decadence of social morality. Contemporary authors complain very often of this state of things. There is a deep feeling of regret and sadness in Horace when he says in Ode III., 24: "The young Roman is no longer devoted to the manly habits of riding and hunting; his skill seems to develop more in the games of chance forbidden by law." But the laws, especially the *lex talaria* prohibiting dice-gambling at meal-times, were powerless against the evil. Cicero mentions the name of a Licinius Lenticula who, after having undergone his penalty for gambling, did not hesitate to repeat the offence in the forum. "Never has the torrent of vice been so irresistible," says Juvenal in Satire I., 87, "or the depths of avarice more absorbing, or the passion for gambling more intense. None approach nowadays the gambling table with the purse; they must carry with them their strong box. What can we think of these profligates more ready to lose one hundred thousand than to give a tunic to a slave dying with cold?"

"What is the advantage," he says in another passage (VIII., 9) "of displaying in your mansion an array of family portraits, when you, unworthy descendants of heroes, pass your nights in gambling?" The contagion of example was felt by the younger generations, and it became customary to see boys assembled round the table, shaking the dice in the box. No wonder that the severity of the republican laws should have been mitigated under this state of things, and perhaps it was a wise thought to open, as it were, a valve of security against this outbreak of human passion. The application of penalties and fines was suspended during the week of the Saturnalia, and the magistrate to whom the surveillance of gambling houses was intrusted was allowed to be lenient and shut his eyes for the time being. But this time was never long enough for gamblers. "Betrayed by the noise of the dice-box which he shakes with trembling hand, he begs the Ædilis to let him try the chance once more" (Martial, V., 85).

So far the poets. If we consult the evidence of historians the colors are still darker. They speak sometimes of the palace

of the Cæsars having been transformed into a gambling den. According to Suetonius, Caligula not only accepted the profits from games of chance, but drew much more from fraud and perjury, cheating freely his guests and friends, *plus mendacio, atque etiam periurio lucrabatur* (c. 41.). Once having asked his neighbor to hold the dice for him, he spied two wealthy Roman knights promenading in the vestibule of the palace. He caused them to be immediately put in irons, confiscated their property, and rushed back to his seat at the dice table, boasting that he had never done a better stroke in his life. Claudius was blindly devoted to the *alea*, having written a treatise on the subject. He even had a carriage built in such a way as to allow him and his party to gamble while travelling. Whoever wanted to make a rapid and brilliant career at court had only to flatter his passion for the dice. Seneca inflicts on him an imaginary, but telling, punishment. He represents the Emperor in hell playing with the dice-box, with a hole at the bottom, so that when he shakes the instrument both dice—*utraque tessera*—slip through the hole : a passage which proves that the Romans played sometimes with two, instead of three dice. Nero, whom naturally one expects to find in such company, was fond of a desperate game, and, according to his biographer (c. 30.), usually put up the stake at four hundred thousand sesterces for each point, a sum corresponding to thirteen thousand four hundred dollars, or thereabouts. Of Domitian we are told that he was always ready to resort to the dice, *quoties otium esset*, even in the morning hours. As regards Commodus, we know from Lampridius that he turned the imperial palace into a regular Monte Carlo, devoted to every excess of refined or brutal profligacy. Being once pressed for money, and unwilling perhaps to borrow from his subjects, he simulated the intention of visiting the African provinces of the empire ; and having thus obtained a grant from the treasury under false pretences, he spent it all in gambling and rioting.

Lucius Verus ranks foremost in the list of Roman imperial gamblers. "Such was his passion for debauchery" [I quote a well known passage of Capitolinus, c. 4] "that on his return from Syria he established a tavern in his own palace, to which he repaired after leaving the table of Marcus Aurelius, and there he partook of the lowest kind of food and drink, and passed the

night in playing games of chance, a passion which he had contracted in Syria."

The contagion of imperial example led to the practical abolition of prohibitory laws. It was only towards the end of the empire that a new attempt was made to check the evil. It was made by Justinian, through a law absolutely forbidding games of chance, and tolerating those of skill, provided the stakes should exceed a fixed maximum. We are ignorant of what results were accomplished by force of law ; we believe, however, that the subsiding of the passion for gambling, after Justinian's age, must be attributed less to his code of government than to the spreading of Christian principles.

RODOLFO LANCIANI.

THE SITUATION IN ITALY.

BY EX-PRIME MINISTER CRISPI.

You have requested me to give to The North American Review an article on the financial condition of Italy, saying that in America the understanding is that the excessive increase in taxation is caused by the adherence of Italy to the Triple Alliance, and that the nation requires relief, particularly by way of reducing the armament. The subject is one of importance, and yet I might dispose of its main features in a few words. The unfavorable state of affairs in Italy is more a matter of right and wrong handling than it is of economic weakness. The financial disorder is temporary and is due rather to the methods hitherto used in the management of taxation than to the exigencies of the State. The Triple Alliance is not the cause of our armament, which, indeed, hardly suffices for the defence of the nation.

The establishment of the unity of Italy was greeted in the new world with sympathy. That unity was effected at the very time when the great American Union was aflame with the War of the Rebellion, which it terminated so triumphantly and from which the United States came forth stronger than ever. The reappearance in the old world of a nation that had been disunited for fourteen centuries was naturally an object of sentimental regard and not of jealousy, especially for America, which owed its discovery to two Italians. These ties that unite us will be strengthened by the erection of the monument to Christopher Columbus in New York.

When Italy had at last been freed from its despots, it lacked many of the absolute requirements of our modern civilization: ports, roads, railways, telegraphs, army, and navy—all were lacking in the new kingdom, and Parliament had to provide for everything. Is it, then, to be wondered at that Italy's financial con-

dition was greatly affected by this state of things, and that both the expenses and the income of the State should have been in process of increase ever since 1861 until the present time?

Surely, when we compare the Italy of to-day with the Italy of 1860, the year in which its unification began, we shall plainly perceive that the two periods radically differ from each other. The taxpaying Italian pays more than he did, but he produces more, and he partakes of all those advantages that were previously lacking.

Ferdinand the Bourbon used to say that there was not in the whole world a more economical government than his; but the reply could have been made that the taxes which his subjects had to pay exceeded the expenses of the public service, and that during his reign not only was liberty hardly known, but works of public utility were absolutely neglected. There were no schools in Naples and Sicily, either elementary or academic, except those of the priests, and the great universities were nearly abandoned. There were only a few railroads, and they served only for strategic purposes. Telegraphs were confined to the large cities; the common roads were incomplete, and the ports inadequate to the interests of commerce.

All this was logical for a king who feared science as he feared the development of human intellect, and who distrusted such means of communication as would imperil the dynasty by bringing the people into closer connection and friendship.

The Kingdom of Italy having been proclaimed, the government went to work with fresh activity to set the State in order in all the branches of public administration. It can certainly not be said that it was always fortunate in the choice of its means, or that it met with no obstacles in its way. Various laws and local prejudices and customs made difficult any unity of plan for the political readjustment of the various provinces of the Peninsula. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that, in the beginning, even men of learning and tried patriotism—among whom we may mention Carlo Cattaneo—preferred the federal form in the organization of the public service. Mazzini's plan of unity prevailed, and Marco Minghetti—who favored a consideration of local claims in the constitution of the government—found no support in the parliament. The Unionists apprehended the resurrection of the old States, and were opposed to all laws tending to maintain even the

...y of them. Fusion was complete, except in the Department ... Justice, a chief magistrate having been retained for five cities, the former capitals of the abolished monarchies. The system of government by communes and provinces, public instruction, the tax system, public works, and the civil and penal codes were applied to Italy with bold uniformity.

The nation did not resist; it obeyed. The national sentiment had pervaded the masses. In the Southern provinces of the Peninsula—where, in the first years, the government was severe, where the brigandage, nurtured by Ferdinand, carried havoc and fire into the country and communes—the citizens submitted patiently to great sacrifices for the regained fatherland, and thus expiated the past.

Italy has, on her boundaries, two military powers of first rank, Austria and France, which more than once have sought to dominate her. The Alps, our natural boundary, are, both in the east and west, open to an easy foreign invasion. We have to watch 2,424 kilometres of sea-coast, and protect two islands, the largest in the Mediterranean; while we must defend our seas against insidious designs of all possible enemies.

France, one of our neighbors, maintains, in time of peace, 510,000 soldiers, and can, in case of war, mobilize 3,060,000. She has a fleet of 587 ships to put in line of battle, and 70 other vessels under construction.

Austria, too, is powerful. She has an army of 318,000 men on a peace footing, and can increase it to 1,900,000 men in case of war. She can send to sea 91 ships, although she should not require them, the Adriatic being narrow and not altogether her own.

Fortunate is the American Union that has nothing to fear from European nations, and nothing from its neighbors. Your people can, therefore, scarcely appreciate the dangers threatening us, but may calmly discuss the question that sooner or later we will have to solve.

No one can determine the day when war will break out. There is, however, every indication that it is inevitable; and I do not, in looking around, see a single government in Europe strong enough to prevent it. The defeats of 1870, causing a hatred unforgotten in the course of years, are preparing the hour of revenge. And this feeling of revenge is not only directed

against Germany, but also against those nations that did not then hasten to the aid of France. The fact that Garibaldi and his valiant soldiers marched, after Sedan, to the defence of the new Republic, did not reconcile the neighboring nation with Italy.

The Franco-Russian alliance is a danger to the liberty of Europe. France sought and obtained this alliance not for the benefit of other nationalities, but for their detriment.

If these two allies should be victorious the equilibrium of the old world would be destroyed, and the nations would feel the consequences. I do not know the conditions of accord between St. Petersburg and Paris, nor whether or not the stipulations between Napoleon and Alexander at Tilsit, and afterwards at Erfurt, were renewed, or even made worse. But I am convinced that France will rue a victory of the Russian armies in the East, and that, sooner or later she will be obliged, in the interests of civilization, to take up arms and fight her ally of to-day.

The results would be equally grave in case France should be defeated. Having lost Alsace and Lorraine in 1870, she would, after a disastrous war, be so broken as to be unable to rise again.

Garibaldi asked, previous to 1860, for a million guns. In 1861, in the Chamber of Deputies, he introduced a bill for the arming of the nation. Various speakers, following his example, maintained in Parliament that it was necessary to reorganize the army and to provide for the fortifications of the frontier and the defences on the seacoast. Liberty is not secure and the independence of the country is always in danger unless its citizens be armed. The methods of organizing the army and the question as to the best military measures for the protection of the State are open to discussion ; but it occurs to no one in old and turbulent Europe that the nation should disarm.

In 1862 a permanent commission was appointed with the function of studying and proposing what is necessary for the defense of the State. This commission, after considering the subject in hand for nine years, reported in 1871 its propositions, which were afterwards modified and are, even to this day, not yet fully put into effect.

The wars of 1866 and 1870 took place while the commission was still at work. Everybody in Europe knows that the war of 1870 excited distrust and fear, and led to extraordinary arma-

ments even in neutral States. Italy did not, however, unduly hasten its work, and only in 1882—before King Humbert had allied himself with the two central empires—was the army definitely organized, and the regulations of national defence were decreed even as late as July, 1884. The Ministry of War was authorized, a year later, to expend the extraordinary sum of two hundred and twelve millions. Part of this sum remained over as a balance, as is seen by the law of December, 1888.

The navy did not fare differently. It became necessary for Italy to repair its fleet after Lissa. In 1873 it was authoritatively declared in Parliament that all the expenses up to that time had been made in vain, that the vessels were unfit for battle, that they should be destroyed and other vessels of different types and better adapted to the purposes should be built. Between the years 1876–1885 the arsenals were properly supplied. All this was done solely for defence, and not for a war of aggression (which nobody wants in Italy). This will be evident on comparing the expenses of our army and navy with those of other European nations. In 1888-9, the most burdensome year for the army, the military expenses amounted to 18 francs for each head, while they were 20 for Germany, 21 for Great Britain, and 25 for France.

Having mentioned France, it may not be inopportune to refer to the exceptional efforts of that country. The French Republic has, since 1870, increased the war budget from 420 to 735 millions of francs, and that of the navy from 182 to 254 millions. She applied, besides, in a special budget, the sum of 1,875 millions to military preparations. She did not content herself with this, however, and set aside, for the same purpose, another sum of 170 millions, by the laws of June and December, 1888.

These comparisons are remarkable ; but I am going to present some others which seem improbable, but which are, nevertheless, true. Italy is even less armed, in proportion to population, than the Helvetian Republic. Switzerland—a neutral State, guaranteed by all the governments of Europe, inaccessible, owing to its mountains—can mobilize 200,000 men, besides the landsturm, which counts also 200,000 men and can be levied whenever the defence of its territory should demand it.

Switzerland has a population of 3,000,000 souls, and Italy with a population of 31,500,000, should, therefore, have 4,200,000

soldiers. But Italy has not got them and cannot have them. Italy can mobilize only 1,200,000 men, *i. e.*, hardly one-fifth of the number that the three powers on her frontier can place in the field.

These figures prove, clearly enough, that the armaments in Italy are not excessive, that they are for the defence of the country, and that they have no connection with the Triple Alliance. Even if Italy freed herself from the ties uniting her with the two neighboring empires she would still be obliged to maintain an army and navy. I may add that this army and navy ought to be more powerful, if Italy intended to exist independently of all international arrangements.

I can not advise isolation for my country under the existing conditions of Europe. Some position must be taken in the old world. Even if Italy wanted to be left alone, she would have to be prepared for eventualities; she must needs be strong enough to send two armies to the Alpine frontiers to oppose, if necessary, any probable enemy, and two fleets on her seas to protect her shores. Neutrality would be impossible in case of war (which, as I said before, seems inevitable) and it would, even if it were possible, have to be guarded. Belgium and Switzerland, being cognizant of this necessity, have not only reorganized their military strength, but have also voted many millions of francs for necessary fortifications.

Italy must, besides, not merely be prepared for possible foreign enemies, but also for her internal foes. In the capital of the kingdom we have the Pope, the pretendant to temporal power, who conspires, and would lend all his means to the success of that power which should attack the young kingdom.

Isolation harmed us in Berlin in 1878, since the two neighboring States strengthened themselves both in the Adriatic and the Mediterranean. France occupied Tunis in 1881 by the consent of the great powers, to the disadvantage of Italy. Austria threatened to reoccupy the Quadrilateral, and Bismarck made peace with the Pope and would not have failed to show him favors if his policy could have been promoted by him.

There are those who entertain an erroneous opinion of the Triple Alliance, guided by the French press, which is interested in depicting, in black colors, to those whom it believes, or professes to believe, to be the enemies of France. Austria and Ger-

many have, since October, 1879, united for mutual defence. Italy sought, in February, 1882, and obtained, after protracted negotiations, an alliance with the two empires. The treaty, renewed in 1887 by Count di Robilant, and in 1891 by the Marquis di Rudini, is only a treaty of defence and its object is only a guaranty of the integrity of the territories of the three monarchies.

The adversaries of this Triple Alliance pretend that this Alliance imposes military duties and pledges for special armaments. Nothing of the kind! This arrangement is not, and never was, necessary. The Allies have not entered into an aggressive alliance, and, as they do not even know what enemy may attack them, no participation of forces can, as yet, be imagined under the hypothesis of a war breaking out against any one of them. Each of them must judge of its own obligations, and hence adapt its own strength for defence.

It is altogether wrong to say that, in consequence of this treaty of alliance, and since 1882, the taxes have been increased in Italy for the purpose of providing for armaments. Not a single new tax has been decreed by Parliament during the last ten years; on the contrary, some taxes have been abolished. The financial disorder—which is, however, not so grave as has been described—is of an economical character, and (as I said above) originated in a faulty method of distributing taxation.

The history of the Italian finances records moments more critical than the present, and yet the country overcame them. But France was then not unfriendly, and was not interested in discrediting us before the world.

There were years, before 1876, in which the maximum of deficits exceeded 700 millions. It was, besides, in the first decade of the Kingdom, during the heroic period in which national unity was established, when it was necessary, in order to supply the deficiency of income, to provide three milliards of francs by the sale of public domain and the emission of bonds.

The ministers asked, for a number of years, for the consent of the nation to these measures, and it responded to their demand willingly and without complaining. Nor were the sacrifices made in vain. Finances began to improve in 1877; the balance closed for a few years with a surplus; but the deficits have re-appeared since 1885, though in a much smaller proportion than between the years of 1862–1876.

The deficits originate more from the diminution of receipts than from the increase of expenses. The idea of popular financiering obtained prevalence in 1878, and the Ministers undertook to change some of the taxes. This change was badly conceived, and badly carried out, so that its effects were greatly injurious to the treasury of the State. The tax on flour was abolished by the law of 1879, that on the other cereals in 1880. This was followed, in 1885 and 1886, by the reduction of the price of salt and the suppression of the war-tithes or land-tax. These laws withdrew from the treasury an income of 148 millions, which would, by natural increase, now amount to more than 160 millions.

It is true that, as an offset to the reduced or abolished taxes, others were decreed (especially on luxuries), but they did not answer the purpose. The income derived from them does not equal the former receipts, nor is it as constant.

The direct taxes—and that on flour was also a direct tax, owing to its mode of collection—are the surest, and the government can count on them. It is otherwise with indirect taxes which are variable, as it were, since they depend on a variety of circumstances that no ministry can control.

The last two Parliaments thought, by a change in taxation, to bring relief to the taxpayers and to rehabilitate the finances of the State—neither of which benefits has been attained. The reform was not successful, but has rather caused disaster to the national exchequer.

These errors in the system of taxation—the consequences of which are still felt—were aggravated by the publication of laws imposing additional expenses on the State.

A bill was brought before Parliament in 1878, the very year in which the change of taxation was suggested, for the reorganization of the railroads, involving an outlay exceeding half a milliard. As the net of railroads was to be extended in successive years, other lines were decreed which will cost about three milliards. It cannot be said that no such work was done before, since from 1861-67 similar laws were enacted by Parliament for piercing the Alps between the two seas, and providing railroads for Sardinia and Sicily. Whilst we are discussing this point, let me give some data to show what has been done in this branch of the public service.

In 1861—the year of the establishment of the new kingdom—

Italy had 2,561 kilometres of railroads; now there are 15,600. The expense increased to 4,300 millions.

Nor were the expenses for other public works (such as ordinary roads, ports, improvements of land, and the bettering of rivers) less great. There were credited in 1862 for these works 23 millions of francs in the State treasury; this amount was increased in 1890 to 69 millions. An extraordinary sum of 678 millions has been added for these works during the last decade.

All this will certainly benefit national development, but it cannot be denied that, for the time being, the State exchequer is seriously affected by it. These expenses have been a great burden on our economical strength, so that the last ministry (that of Rudini) was compelled to reduce them.

But this does not suffice. A new arrangement in taxation is required, if the laws enacted from 1879 to 1886 are to be maintained. The effect of these laws has been pernicious, as, without them, the Italian treasury could have counted on a sum which, from January 1, 1884, to end of 1891, may be calculated to amount to 1,200 millions of francs. This sum would not merely have upheld the balance, but have yielded a surplus.

The true cause of the financial disorder of the kingdom of Italy will become evident from what has been stated above. The armaments did not influence it, much less the Triple Alliance, the organization of the army and navy, as well as the other preparations for national defence, being entirely independent thereof. Let us now look at the condition of our finances.

The deficit for the financial budget of 1892–1893, as shown by the documents presented to the Chambers by the Ministry of Rudini, amounts, in round numbers, to 46 millions, and for the budget of 1893–1894, to 65 millions. These figures comprise the expenses for the railroads, which are no longer to be charged to the State credit. The extraordinary military expenses are not included, which cannot exceed 15 millions of francs, in case they are limited to what is urgently required, and if there is no intention of supplying the soldiers with new guns of small calibre. Whenever the government shall decide on the construction of the new gun, it shall be expedient to do so by the sale of bonds, which method would also be preferable in the construction of railways.

In truth, such a deficit in a balance of 1,700 millions is not so

grave as to justify alarm. A people of thirty-one millions has the power, if it is willing, to find the way out of these difficulties. The kingdom of Italy—as said before—had twelve times as great financial disorders before and knew how to settle them without the world noticing it. And even to-day nobody would have taken any notice of them, if a certain journalism had not, for political ends, been anxious to throw, with ungenerous persistency, discredit upon a nation the future of which seems to be a menace to some people.

Italy is continually progressing, both morally and economically. Its wealth is on the increase; they deceive or wish to deceive themselves, who say that that wealth is exhausted. It suffices to consult our statistics of to-day and to compare them with those of 1861 and 1864, to understand the progress made since then.

I stated that we had 2,561 kilometres of railways in 1861: to-day we have 15,600 kilometres. Our steamers on the sea numbered hardly 80, with a capacity of 18,000 tons, when the new kingdom began its existence; there are now 290 of them, with a capacity of 187,000 tons. The same progress is seen in our international commerce, which, in 1861, had a value of 1,406 millions (in imports and exports) and has increased to-day to a value of two milliards.

The production of cereals rose from 71,303,000 hectolitres in 1862 to 94,245,000 in 1890; that of wine—one of Italy's special exports—amounted, in 1862, to 24,003,000 hectolitres, and reached 36,760,000 hectolitres in 1890.

As to mechanical industries Italy was tributary to foreign countries. She progressed slowly, and while ten years ago she produced annually to the value of 80 millions of francs, to-day she produces 100 millions. The textile industries were not less fortunate. We produced so little that our fabrics did not suffice for domestic consumption. We now begin to export to foreign markets, and the export of 184,000 kil. in 1887 has increased to 270,000 kil. in 1891. Wages have advanced in proportion to increased production. Fourteen centesimi per hour were paid in 1861, now we pay twenty-five. It should be noted, also, that this economic movement has greatly benefited the working classes and increased capital. The advantage of saving money was unknown up to 1861. The first savings-banks yielded, in fact, such small results

that they were not worth mentioning. But, nowadays, progress is sure and continuous. The deposits amounted, in 1872, to 465 millions, and in 1889 to 1,787 millions.

Another proof of improved conditions is presented, finally, in the decrease of emigration. In comparing the first three months of 1891 with those of 1892 we find that in 1891, 34,058 individuals emigrated permanently and 49,071 temporarily ; in 1892, permanent emigration embraced only 25,337, and temporary 48,847 people.

These statements will not fail to enlighten public opinion in the great Union, and to place slanders in the proper light.

My words express a deep conviction, and the facts presented cannot be disputed. My figures will not astound the great people of the new world, but they will convince my readers that Italy, within the few years of her national existence, has progressed, and has not disappointed her friends, who would have felt regret if the old land of civilization—the mother of arts and sciences—had not fulfilled the duties of a great nation.

CRISPI.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A TILT AT A BLACK MONSTER.

In olden days, when symbol was a prominent factor in material and spiritual life, there resulted many conditions which had good reasons for being. A setting of dramatic effectiveness accompanied almost every action. The popular mind was moved by object lessons; for man had not yet progressed beyond the demonstrative age. But little by little this aspect changed. The matter-of-fact superseded the romantic, until at last the individual and the state hardened into the present mould of materialism. Iconoclastic hammers beat against the gates of every temple; a call arose for originality in thought and repression in conduct. Pruning scissors nipped at all conventionality, from costume to sentiment, until there came to be small reverence and less precedent; the boldness and freedom that dared revolt was the first requisite of mental behavior. We learned to dote upon eccentricity, whatever form it assumed—which was fortunate, since realism often gave an extremely ugly fetish for worship. The dominant chord of what might be termed intellectual etiquette was struck when old rules were broken, or old authority reviled.

In the face of such revolution, how can we account for the tenacity with which some of those earlier customs still retain their hold? Why do we continue to wear mourning, for instance? Under the ancient régime there was doubtless a certain appropriateness between the forms of such dress and the usages from which they were established. These are still maintained among semi-civilized nations. The white-robed Chinese withdraws even from official public duty while he wears the garb of sorrow; the Japanese remains in absolute privacy; the Feejee Islander hides his burned body and mutilated hands from sight. The Greeks, the Romans, the Syrians, the Persians, mourned their dead in remote and solitary places. There was probably a time when, even for us, pleasure was made to halt at sight of crape wrappings, and when the "inky cloak" really personified the gulf between the world and the mourner.

How is it to-day? The most conservative devotee of conventionalism would find himself strangely put about to carry out such a programme. Propriety has yielded to the eager knocking of the world at its doors, and to its importunate demands upon the attention which is still, under the sombre veil of its funereal trappings, supposed to be immovably fixed upon the contemplation of death. Human nature is weak. We rarely find the summons totally unheeded. So the uniform of retirement comes to be seen in conspicuous places. It is found in the streets, the shops, the lecture-room, the concert hall. We even meet it—in some of those shadings of graded grief prescribed by the rigorous dictum of fashion—assisting at afternoon teas, and those other functions of insipid entertainment which make up the somewhat unchristian year of this end of the century. How can one who has ever known the crushing but refining grace of sorrow bear this wretched travesty, which seems to measure for the public eye its successive stages of consolation? Or is there some special spiritual affinity between

judicious combinations of white and gray and violet, and the healing of a stricken soul? How the honesty of grief must shrink from this lie of apparent forgetfulness!

Or must we insult nature by assuming that it is necessary to keep desolate memory true to its task. Would the heart wander without sight of the sable garment? How otherwise can we bear to make public the most personal hurt humanity has to bear,—the one grief which intimately and only concerns one's self? We do not wear some peculiar mark to blazen forth suffering to our honor, or loss to our estate, or taint upon our morality. Yet society has much more to do with such misfortune than with our beloved dead. Why should we challenge the attention of the world to the one sorrow in which it has least interest?

Suppose we beg the question and allow that there is some occult harmony between black and consolation. There are still exceptions to be taken. Why must the widow and orphan be forced to choose a certain brand of cloth, a certain species of fur, a certain finish of ruche and lace? Or why should what is eminently proper this season be unfit for last year or the next? And what of the intrusion of worldliness which the preparation of these "customary suits of solemn black" thrusts into the first moments of bereavement. Those few precious hours of communion left on earth, to be broken in upon by questions of fit and style, by suggestions of quality and modishness from persons to whom your anguish is matter of curiosity only or speculation! What of the nervous depression from which so many sensitive natures suffer under the spiritual and material weight of those sombre trappings. What of cost—the matter of so little moment to the few, but of such anxious stress to the many. The whims or weakness of the rich woman lays a bitter cross upon the already overburdened shoulders of her poorer sister here; for the robing which is but etiquette for the one, becomes enforced religious duty for the other. The laws of caste among the Hindoos are not more rigid than those which bind such observances on the class least able to conform to them. It adds new horror to the deathbed of poverty—this knowledge of the inexorable force which will oblige the wife to spend her last cent, or to pawn her scant household plenishing, for the black which must be worn until it drops away from dirt and age.

To sum up in brief: the custom is outworn; it is an anachronism in the nineteenth century. It is unchristian; it clouds the spiritual significance of the resurrection with the ever-present expression of temporal loss. It is cruel; it forces helpless and innocent people into action which entails privation and unnecessary suffering. It is untruthful; it makes false outward show of changes in sentiment. And it is essentially vulgar; for it presses private affairs upon public notice; it thrusts claims of fashion and frivolity upon a time which most greatly moves the heights and depths of being; and it forces its superficial worldliness into the fiercest throes which can ever rend human nature. Why then do we still wear mourning?

MARY ELIZABETH BLAKE.

THE ENGLISH REPORTER.

DURING a long and varied experience of newspaper work on both sides of the Atlantic, it has struck me that the American newspaper man, particularly the reporter, has a much more interesting and eventful career than the English reporter. Both are engaged in the collection of news, but the

methods adopted vary very considerably, and so does the training for the work. As a rule, the English reporter comes to the work earlier than the American. He begins his life as early as sixteen or seventeen years of age, in fact, at as early an age as he would be allowed without detriment to his morals to attend the police court and sit out the cases which come before the magistrates. The English reporter always begins his career in the police courts, thus reversing the order observed in American newspaper offices, where police work is usually assigned to the more experienced men. Our reporters are very largely drawn from the composing rooms of small country offices. University graduates seldom become reporters in England; they do not go in for press work to anything like the extent they do in America. When they do take up newspaper work they are usually over twenty-three years of age; most of them have some influence behind them, and secure positions as sub-editors—copy readers as they would be called in America—or as secretaries and general factotums to editors. They thus obtain their start in journalism without going through the training and experience, both of work and life, which fall to the lot of the reporter. I have a wide acquaintance with newspaper men of all ranks and grades in London and in our large provincial towns, and cannot call to mind half a dozen University men on the press who began their careers as reporters. In fact, the number of university men finding positions on English newspapers is not at all large; as outside contributors or free lances, very many men of this class add something to their own incomes.

Two of our London morning newspapers—the *Times* and the *Morning Post;* two of our evening papers—the *St. James's Gazette* and the *Pall Mall Gazette,* and in the provinces, one paper in Manchester, one in Sheffield, and another in Bristol are edited by university graduates. In these three provincial cases, the editors went straight from the university to the editorial chair, owing to the fact that the positions had been held open for them, their fathers or some near relatives having been the owners of the papers. Until within eighteen months only two London daily journals were edited by university men—the *Times* and the *Morning Post.* Neither Mr. Stead who edited the *Pall Mall Gazette,* nor Mr. Frederic Greenwood, who edited the *St. James's Gazette,* is a University man. But when Mr. Stead left the *Pall Mall Gazette* to establish the *Review of Reviews,* he was succeeded by a university graduate, and the same thing happened when Mr. Frederic Greenwood resigned the editorial chair of the *St. James's Gazette.* The university men actively associated with the London daily press can almost be counted on one's fingers, and as a general thing the London press still recruits its staff men from among those who have begun life either in the composing room or with the city editor.

Stenography is the key to a commencing position on almost any English newspaper, a fact which in itself accounts for much of the dulness and sameness of our journals when contrasted with those of America, where stenography is at a discount, and little room is found for a reporter who relies solely upon his ability to take down a speech in shorthand and write it out for the compositor with fair speed and accuracy. There are hundreds of reporters on the London and provincial daily and weekly newspaper press who have been trained after the English fashion, and who, if they were transplanted to America, would not get a second assignment from a city editor on any enterprising paper. The training these men have had in England would be worse than useless to them in America. There is such

a sameness in the way of doing English reporting that the English training, in five cases out of six, knocks all the individuality out of young men, and keeps them hopelessly down to the level of the mere shorthand writer. Any American visiting London who has attended a meeting at St. James's Hall or at the Holborn Town Hall, will have been struck with this on reading the reports in the morning papers the next day. The introductory sentences seldom vary except in a few verbal details, and then come the shorthand writer's summaries of the chairman's speech and of those of the subsequent speakers. In none of the reports is there any attempt to describe the meeting or the spirit which actuated and characterized it. The ordinary London reporter does not regard this as within his duty. If he is instructed to do a column report of the meeting, he relies upon his shorthand notes for every line of it after he has stated, in a short and stereotyped introduction, where the meeting was held, what it was called for, who was in the chair and how many people attended.

The same style of work characterizes all our newspapers, from the *Times's* report of a St. James's Hall meeting in London to the report in the *Little Peddlington Gazette* of the meeting held in the Little Peddlington Town Hall. If he is safe as regards his shorthand, the reporter who has done the Little Peddlington meeting for his paper can do the St. James's Hall meeting for the *Times*, or take a turn in the Press Gallery of the House of Commons. His shorthand, however, must be unimpeachable, as the speakers themselves will complain of any inaccuracies that may have crept into the report of their speeches. This constitutes almost the whole training of the English reporter. If some daring reporter on an English paper, happening to possess some individuality, were to strike out in a different line, he would be snubbed and in all probability called upon to write out another report after the time-honored and stereotyped fashion.

In America, I have frequently heard people say that they never saw an old reporter, and express wonder as to what became of reporters after they reached thirty-five or forty years of age. No one who knows Fleet Street intimately would make such a remark concerning English reporters. There are hundreds of men in London and all over England between fifty and sixty-five years of age, who are still at work as reporters, and are turning in their copy exactly as they did thirty or forty years ago, when they were sent to do their first "turn" at the Police Court, or to attend their first meeting of the Town Council. By this time they are no doubt more adept at their work, but the work itself is characterized by no more individuality or originality than their very earliest efforts. Men of this class, even when not advanced in years, would be hopeless failures in America. Many of them have never in their lives turned in a special, or written an account of anything to which they were not assigned, and would be all at sea if their stenography were no longer available. They could not comprehend the dictum of the Chicago city editor, who instructs new members of his staff that any incident in the street which causes twenty people to pause to see what is going on, is, if neatly handled, good enough for a news item. They know nothing of "scoops" or "exclusives;" they are ignorant of the pleasurable intoxication arising from a really good scoop, and alike also of the wrath of the city editor and the gloom and depression which follow being scooped. If English reporters of this type were put on the unassigned list on an American paper, and told to turn in specials to be paid on space, they would not earn their car fares.

The life of reporters in London is much easier-going than in New York or Boston, and needs far less alertness and brains; but there is not half the adventure connected with it that there was even twenty-five years ago. Nowadays the ordinary reporters are seldom sent beyond the city limits. All the papers take the services of the press association and of kindred news-gathering organizations, and thereby cut off their own staffs from the travel and incident which they enjoyed in the days when telegraphy was in its infancy and each newspaper sent its own men up and down the country. When Parliament is out of session, there are many men attached to the London morning papers whose day's work is represented by a twenty line paragraph. The interview is being gradually adopted in London, and, to some small extent, it is introducing a little more incident into the work of newspaper reporters. We have not yet gone the length of sending a reporter to a manufacturer or a merchant to ask whether it is true that his notes have been stopped at the bank, as it was once my fate to do in St. Louis. But we are moving in that direction. A week or two ago, the *Globe* sent a reporter to ask the managing editor of the *Daily Telegraph* whether it was true that this paper was about to desert the Unionist cause. That was rather a domestic question, and so were those which a few days later were put to Messrs. Ingram Bros., of the *Illustrated London News*, who were asked by the interviewer whether it was true that their mother, an old lady of 80, was about to marry Sir Edward Watkin, M. P., the Jay Gould of the English railway system, who is 74 years of age.

There is not nearly so much *esprit de corps* among the English reporters attached to the same journal as there is in America. The newspaper offices in London have no large halls in which the reporters meet the city editors, write out their copy, and associate with one another. Reporters on the same staff frequently do not see each other for weeks together. The instructions as to assignments are sent to reporters by mail, and all that is necessary is that the work should reach the office in reasonable time. The men write out their copy at home or at their clubs, send it in by messenger, and sometimes do not themselves go near the office from one pay day to another. Nor is there anything like the same loyalty to work and to paper among English reporters as there is among American. "The Manchester *Guardian* does not want zeal, it wants a column," is a remark attributed to one of the London reporters of that journal, who, while attending a meeting at Westminster, was apprised that another meeting of great importance to his paper had been unexpectedly called in an adjoining room. The reporter had been instructed to do a column of the meeting he was at, and it was no concern of his if another meeting of equal importance was missed altogether. It has been said of another well-known journalist, who is now an editor, that in his reporting days, if he had been returning from a trivial meeting at the Mansion House, and had noticed on his way to Fleet Street that St. Paul's Cathedral was on fire, he would not have thought of apprising the city editor of the fact.

EDWARD PORRITT.

RAILWAY SAFETY APPLIANCES.*

THE publication of statistics giving the number of casualties to employees in railway service has led to a demand for legislation to compel the

* See in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for February, 1892, the articles "A Year of Railroad Accidents," by Col. H. G. Prout, and "A Perilous Business and the Remedy," by the Hon. H. C. Lodge

use of appliances for their protection. Persistent faith in such remedial legislation is unaffected by the existence of many statutes which are impotent because they were hastily devised to meet a popular demand and were not suited to the condition of affairs which they were intended to remedy.

In this case public interest has been aroused by statements as to the number of casualties which occur in coupling cars, amounting in the year ending June 30, 1890, to 369 killed and 7,842 injured out of a total number of 182,703 men so employed. These figures are indeed suggestive of affliction and suffering and may well induce us to seek a remedy. But in seeking that remedy we must first consider the cause. These casualties result from the exposure by the men of their limbs or their bodies between the cars, and the remedy lies in avoiding the exposure. With the ordinary form of coupler this was attempted by furnishing employees with sticks to guide the coupling links into position while they stand out of the line of the cars. In many cases the men refused to avail themselves of these sticks, for they looked upon their use as cowardice—so it was evident that they could only be kept from between the cars by the adoption of some device that would admit of coupling by impact. This matter had the attention of the railway companies as early as 1869, when, at the meeting of the Master Car Builders Association, Mr. Adams, now of the Boston & Albany Railroad, said, "It is a duty that we owe to the companies that we represent, and a duty that we owe to our fellow-men who are necessarily placed in positions that endanger them, to adopt some height that will be uniform." In 1873 a committee of this Association reported upon the desirability of adopting a standard self-coupler, and at the meeting in 1878 attention was called to the importance of having the several patterns of self-couplers to couple interchangeably.

In 1888 the Janney type was adopted by a vote of 474 to 194, and the Executive Committee undertook to establish "the contour lines of this type, and the preparation of the drawings and templets which would definitely determine and exhibit the standard of the Association." With the publication of these lines the standard of the Association was fixed; there were some further matters of detail to be decided, and in 1889 the Master Car Builders' type of coupler was formally adopted in all respects as the standard coupler of the Association. Some organized action was now necessary on the part of the managing officers of the railroad companies to make the action of their technical officials effective. This was sought to be accomplished through the American Railway Association, an organization of railroad companies formed some years ago "for the development and solution of problems connected with railroad management in the mutual interest of the railroad companies of America." At first organized as the General Time Convention, its success in the establishment of standard time and of a standard code of train rules led to a recognition of its usefulness in a broader sphere, and it now represents a membership of over 130,000 miles of railroad mileage out of the total of over 170,000 miles in this country.

At a meeting of this Association in April, 1890, attention was called to this matter by the President, who said: "There are improvements in methods and appliances now passing from the experimental stage, in which they are properly the subjects for consideration in technical associations, to the stage in which the responsible managements of our railroad systems must decide whether they will recognize them as sufficiently valuable for general adoption."

In October, 1890, the Committee on Safety Appliances recommended the

adoption of the Master Car Builders' type of coupler as the standard of its members. Out of fifty companies voting but two dissented, so it may be said that in 1890 this coupler was recognized by the railroad companies of this country as their standard, so far as this could be done by their organized action. From statistics recently obtained by this Association we have reason to believe that couplers of the Master Car Builders' type have now been applied to 200,000 cars, or about one-fifth of the freight cars in service, and also to 25,000 cars now under contract. From what is here stated it will be seen that the railroad companies through their technical officials have devised a type of coupler which does not require the introduction of body or limb between the cars in the process of coupling or of uncoupling. The device is manipulated by a rod, one end of which projects beyond the car body in such a position that it can be safely handled even by a person unaccustomed to its use.

Under this statement of facts what is to be accomplished through compulsory legislation? The answer may be given in the language of the Massachusetts Railroad Commission: "Those who urged that there should be no legislation at all on the subject claimed that the railroad companies were proceeding in the development and adoption of automatic couplers as rapidly as possible, and that any legislation would be likely to saddle upon the country some unsatisfactory and imperfect device; would impose upon the railroad companies great expense and no corresponding benefit to the employees, and would in fact be a bar to progress towards perfection. This argument is of weight and should not be disregarded, unless the circumstances are of a nature so exceptional as to justify a departure from a principle of legislation which for many years has been generally adhered to in this State with satisfactory results."

There can be no justification for legislation upon this subject unless it can be shown that the railroad companies will not voluntarily protect their employees from injury by the adoption of some device which has been proven in actual service to fulfil this purpose. That they will not voluntarily adopt such a device has been assumed by some of the advocates of compulsory legislation who, apparently in ignorance of what has been done, propose various measures for the protection of employees. One plan is that the proper form of coupler shall be determined by vote of the organizations of switchmen and trainmen, and a bill embodying this idea has been submitted to a Congressional committee. Its utter impracticability can be readily shown. There are but two types of coupler in actual use—the link-and-pin and the Master Car Builders' vertical-hook type. The former cannot be used with power brakes on freight trains. This narrows down the choice to the Master Car Builders' type or "something better." If any other device besides the link and pin is in actual use, it is unknown to railroad managers. How then can a vote of employees determine anything not already determined by the railroad companies?

Another plan is to seek the desideratum with the aid of a commission to be composed of railroad employees, mechanical experts, and unemployed statesmen, which, at the public expense, is to select or cause to be invented something better than the Master Car Builders' coupler.

But the railroad companies cannot be expected to disregard the experience acquired by their technical officials, to abandon the coupler which embodies years of investigation and thought, and to reject the organized action of the managing officials of 130,000 miles of railroad. Admitting

this, what would compulsory legislation accomplish except perhaps to hasten the application of the Master Car Builders' type of coupler upon the equipment of those companies not members of the Association? Those companies which are members will assert that they are proceeding with the work as rapidly as circumstances will warrant.

The cost of standard couplers for the 900,000 cars now equipped with link-and-pin couplers will not be far from $25,000,000, and this expenditure cannot, in many cases, be provided for from income account. The narrowing margin between the rate and cost per ton mile will not permit of it. The means must then be obtained from capital account by the sale of stocks or bonds. If the condition of the money market be unfavorable for placing these securities how can compulsory legislation aid in finding a purchaser?

There are those who admit that the companies, members of the American Railway Association, have discharged their duty toward their employees in adopting the Master Car Builders' type of coupler, but who insist on legislation to compel its adoption by companies not members of that Association. The advocates of this policy should consider that the coupler question did not pass out of the experimental stage until the action of the American Railway Association in October, 1890. To railroad managers the progress already made is a satisfactory assurance that the work will go on without any compulsion beyond that to be derived from the pressure of public opinion and the growing recognition of the advantages to follow from falling in with general practice. These forces have been strong enough to compel the adoption of a uniform system of coupling passenger trains with couplers of the Master Car Builders' type, and the opponents of compulsory legislation can fairly maintain that what has been accomplished with passenger cars can be accomplished with freight cars.

A penal statute concerning technical matters should carry with the penalty to those who disregard its provisions some protection to those who obey them. Are the advocates of penal legislation prepared to relieve railroad corporations from responsibility for damages to those injured while using the devices prescribed by such legislation? A statute defective in this respect might be sustained in the courts, but it would be none the less injustice under the guise of law.

There is another reason why it is to the public interest not to interfere by legislation in the mechanical operations of a railroad. Any attempt of the kind has the effect of paralyzing progress in that particular direction. It serves to dull the inventive mind and to petrify the art at the stage which it has reached at that time. The wonderful development in the construction and operation of railroads in this country as compared with the progress made in those countries in which the details of management are under government regulation furnishes overwhelming testimony to the fact just stated,—and American legislators may well pause before committing themselves to a policy which the Massachusetts Railroad Commission says is "a departure from a principle of legislation which for many years has been generally adhered to in this State with satisfactory results."

H. S. HAINES,
President of the American Railway Association.

THE PEACEFUL CONQUEST OF NEW ENGLAND.

AT THE moment when the readers of the nation are rejoicing in the completion of Mr. Parkman's story of the conquest of France by England

in the New World more than a century ago, our attention is called to a singularly persistent and slowly successful effort on the part of the people of what was once called New France to make a conquest, under the joint appeals of patriotism and religion, of New England.

Statements in regard to this matter are not new. The conquest has been a matter of observation to any one who has watched the resettlement of the rural districts of the New England States, or who has made himself acquainted with the way in which the French-Canadians have established themselves in its large towns and manufacturing centres, and an Andover professor, Dr. Egbert C. Smyth, has recently made a careful study of the steps in this conquest from the original documents in the proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society. He calls his paper "The French-Canadians in New England," and in it he shows that there are at the present time about 400,000 French-Canadians, almost entirely Roman Catholics, in New England, and that they hold property to the value of nearly $22,000,000. These people are engaged in a great variety of occupations. Dr. Smyth says: "A very large proportion work in the shoe, cotton, or other factories, but no one of the ordinary trades or professions seems to be unappropriated. Besides carpenters, clothiers, grocers, bakers, and other dealers in the necessaries or customary conveniences, the ordinary arts are well represented, and enterprise has extended itself to a great variety of business employments. There are also commissioners af various kinds, justices of the peace, sheriffs, policemen, health officers, city councillors, inspectors of customs, registrars, members of legislatures, notaries, lawyers, doctors, journalists, teachers, and clergymen." This means that they are in all the walks of life, and that they have come to stay.

If, like the Irish-Americans, they had come among us with their fine instincts of patriotism ready to be enkindled in favor of the institutions of the country in which they proposed to live, and if they had shown this in learning the language and in taking an interest in our schools and in the different ways in which their children, if not themselves, could be made acquainted with our social and political life, we could find no fault with their citizenship or their intentions; but in the spirit which they manifest and in the confession of their ultimate object in the somewhat extended literature which they have already published, it is seen that they under the lead of French-Canadian priests who are confessedly aiming at the repeopling and reconstruction of New England.

The plan is to push the French-Canadians to the highest point of prolific families, and to make it a religious duty to hold intact the system of religious absolutism in which they have been educated. New England is the paradise of the poor French-Canadian. By insisting that marriages shall be contracted early, and by placing the women who shall be the mothers of the largest number of children on the list of public benefactors, the French of the old régime have almost crowded the English out of the Province of Quebec, so that the French race and the Roman Catholic Church are almost supreme in that part of Canada.

For more than a generation the same tactics have been employed in securing the permanent settlement of the French-Canadians in the parts of New England most favorable to their industrial success and to the creation and support of large families. At first, the Roman Catholic bishops in the New England States did not favor this emigration. It was looked upon also by the authorities at Quebec as likely to endanger the souls of their people;

but now it is taken up with the zeal of a crusade, and great encouragement is offered to all the French-Canadians who are ready and willing to settle in New England; and to all appearance Quebec is brought down bodily with its parish, its church, its presbytery, its convent, and parochial school, and planted at the centres of New England life, without the slightest idea of adjusting anything in its system to the new conditions which surround it. The people are looked after by the parochial clergy and by itinerant priests, and every effort is made to hold them to their traditional faith, their native language, and all their characteristic ideas and habits.

The religions associations of these people are distinctly arranged to keep them closely together. Their motto is, "*Notre Religion, Notre Langue, et Nos Moeurs.*" There are 210 of these societies in New England, with 30,540 members. The rule is that each member must be a French-Canadian, speak the French language, and belong to the Roman Catholic Church. They cannot belong to any society that the Church does not approve of. They may be loyal to the government of the United States, but their hearts must remain true to their first loves, their own nationality, and to the customs, traditions, aspirations, and faith in which they have been bred as French-Canadians. They are a solid French unit under the control of their priests, a body that can be employed for political as well as ecclesiastical purposes, and with a distinctly religious end in view. They come from a stock that has the inherent power to root out and overcome other races—the Scandinavian stock that created Normandy in France, and that has the power to change New England into New France when it can send its roots down into the soil. They represent the same stock that has led in racial contests in the old world through many centuries. Their characteristic qualities are seen with distinctness in parishes and in districts in Canada to-day, and it is these people whom the priests have inspired with the idea that their children are to be men of destiny, and that their mission is to make the peaceful conquest of New England in the generations of the future. While we do not wish to be alarmists, it cannot be denied that Dr. Smyth makes out a strong case, and that the dangers which threaten New England, if not immediate, are much more serious than one would like to confess. The solidity and the power to march like a regiment into the heart of the country make these people formidable, and so long as they are able to reject the English language and the public school, they will be beyond the influences which will make them the right kind of American citizens.

JULIUS H. WARD.

ORIENTAL PILGRIMAGES AND CHOLERA.

THERE has been recently issued from the government printing office a volume of 945 pages, a "Report on Cholera in Europe and India," by Dr. Edward O. Shakespeare, who was appointed a special United States Commissioner in 1885 to go abroad and "make investigation of the causes, progress, and proper prevention and cure" of cholera. Not in the way of criticism upon this excellent report, but rather as a corollary to it and to previous literature on the spread of cholera, I offer some suggestions. Two facts are noteworthy: (1). From the earliest history of the disease, whenever it has entered any country outside of India, cholera could be traced back to its home in Bengal. (2). Whenever it has invaded Western Asia, Africa, Europe, or North or South America, it has been traceable to pilgrims and their usual routes of travel to and from their pilgrimages to Mecca, Hurdwar, Meschid and Kiev. Six times in seventy years has cholera gone out of Bengal and spread

to Europe by the two great pilgrim routes. These two routes are: (1). From Calcutta and other parts of Bengal up the Ganges to the sacred city of Hurdwar, on the direct land route to the Caspian and Black seas and the Russian frontier. (2). From Bengal through India to Bombay and thence to Mecca. Given an outbreak of cholera at Hurdwar or at Mecca and the civilized world is endangered for from one to five years.

We know that cholera has never originated anywhere else than in India; that it has never been carried from India to Europe by the direct water route; that it has never appeared in America until after Europe was infected; and that every infection of Egypt, Europe, and America is traceable to infected pilgrims from India. The land route of cholera to Europe is from Calcutta and other parts of Bengal up the Ganges to Hurdwar, at the source of the river at the base of the Himalaya Mountains. At least half a million people—mostly pilgrims—are at Hurdwar in April of each year, and about 3,000,000 every twelfth year.

To Meschid, the holy city of Persia, west of Herat, during eight months of the year, pilgrims come by tens of thousands from India and Afghanistan, Turkey in Asia, the Caucasus, the shores of the Black and the Caspian seas, and from all over Persia. The Indian pilgrims take the land route *via* Hurdwar, Cabul, and Herat, or the land and water route *via* the Persian Gulf and across Persia. To Mecca go pilgrims from all parts of Northern Africa, from points in Southeastern Europe, from Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, India, Buchara, and other Oriental points. Between Bengal and Europe, then, there are three centres of infection, each one, so to speak, a cholera metropolis.

In 1826 cholera spread out of its endemic area in Bengal. Going through Afghanistan and Persia it reached Orenburg, to the north of the Caspian Sea, in 1829, and thence entered Russia, where it raged in 1830. In 1831 pilgrims carried it from India to Mecca, where it killed about half the pilgrims. Returning pilgrims carried it to Alexandria and Constantinople, whence it was carried to St. Petersburg, Sweden, Hamburg, and Northern Europe. In 1832 it entered France, causing 120,000 deaths, crossed to England and Ireland, and was sent to Quebec in five ships from London, Liverpool, Cork, Limerick, and Dublin.

In 1840–41 cholera went with a British force from Calcutta to China. Spreading through the Chinese and Burmese empires in 1841, 1842, and 1843, it passed westward through Kashgar to Buchara in 1843 and 1844, and on to Cabul. From Cabul it reached Russia, went through Europe, and appeared at Sunderland, England, in October, 1848. It was already in France, and from Havre it arrived at Staten Island on the "New York" on December 2, 1848, and at New Orleans on the "Swanton," from Havre, on December 11. On December 20 it reached Memphis by steamer, remained partly quiescent till spring, when it spread over the Mississippi Valley and to California.

In 1849–50 cholera was very fatal in Bengal, and extended to the Punjaub and into the central provinces. Following the two routes it extended from Bombay and the Punjaub into Persia and Arabia in 1851–52–53. It claimed 11,000 victims in Teheran, and entered Russia by the Caspian Sea route. Carried to Egypt by pilgrims, it went to Messina, where it caused 12,000 deaths; to France, 114,000 deaths; and to England, 16,000 deaths. In 1854 some emigrant ships carried it from Europe to New York, whence it extended over a part of the United States and Canada. The fourth epidemic that reached this country left Bengal in 1862–63. Carried from Bom-

bay to the shores of the Red Sea by pilgrims, it broke out among the pilgrims at Mecca in December, 1864. Returning pilgrims carried it to Egypt. It broke out at Alexandria in May, 1865, whence it was carried to Europe. In 1866 it reached Halifax and New York, from which places it spread.

The great twelfth-year Juggernaut epidemic of 1841 had scarcely abated when the equally great Hurdwar epidemic of 1843 occurred. In 1844 cholera was in Afghanistan, and in May, 1845, it was at Kandahar, taking 300 lives a day. It reached Cabul in June and Herat in July. In February, 1846, it was carried to Meschid, whence it went east and west through Persia, following the great roads, reaching Astrabad in May and Teheran in June. Both in 1831 and in 1846 cholera appeared just at the time when pilgrims were flocking from all sides. Following the west coast of the Caspian Sea in November, 1846, it invaded the same towns as in 1823 and 1831. Here it remained until March, 1847, when it reappeared on the shores of the Caspian Sea. In May it was among the Cossacks, and then invaded Russia *via* Kherzon, at the mouth of the Dneiper.

Few have a definite idea of the destruction caused by cholera. In Egypt in 1883 it caused from 30,000 to 50,000 deaths in three months. Going to France it claimed 15,000 victims in 1884–86; Spain lost 180,000 people in 1884–85; Italy about 50,000 in 1884–87. The epidemic cost Europe about 250,000 people and about $500,000,000, according to Dr. Shakespeare.

For two years cholera, brought to Jeddah and Mecca by pilgrims, and distributed through El Hedjaz, had threatened Egypt. Both in 1881 and in 1882 it had followed and preyed upon Egyptian pilgrims on their return from Mecca. And Dr. Shakespeare, after carefully weighing all the evidence, concludes that "although it has been extremely difficult to absolutely trace the outbreak of cholera at Damietta in June of 1883 to direct introduction from India, there can be no reasonable doubt that such was its origin." It is generally stated that this epidemic first appeared in Europe at Toulon in 1884. But a report to the Department of State by the U. S. Consul at Marseilles leaves but little doubt that cholera was imported into that city directly from Egypt in 1883, and that its presence was successfully concealed until after the Toulon outbreak in 1884 and an investigation. It is possible that it was carried from Marseilles to Toulon in 1884. In November, 1886, it was carried from Genoa to Buenos Ayres, whence it spread to Chili, and in December from Italy to Montevideo. In the autumn of 1887 it was brought to New York on some French steamer from Marseilles, which had taken on emigrants at Naples, but efficient sanitary measures saved the country. Yet the germs might have been brought from Marseilles or Toulon before the presence of cholera was recognized or admitted in those cities. Or it might have been brought directly from Egypt in the winter or spring of 1883.

It is beyond human possibility to put India in good sanitary condition in any reasonable time, and to make the pilgrims observe the commonest rules of hygiene and cleanliness would require two soldiers for each pilgrim. The most riotous imagination could scarcely exaggerate the filth of India and Egypt and of the Hindoo and Mohammedan pilgrims, for when people use the same water for bathing, washing soiled clothes, and drinking, they are scarcely ripe for moral suasion. So long as the pilgrimages continue Europe and this country will be endangered and will be visited by cholera, in spite of the millions of dollars spent in precautionary measures. These millions should be spent in a definite and efficient manner.

PEORIA, Ill. WILLIAM G. EGGLESTON, M. D.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXIX.

AUGUST, 1892.

ENGLISH ELECTIONS AND HOME RULE.

BY HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

IN WRITING for American readers mainly I feel as if I were addressing friends. Some of the most intimate friends I have ever had in life have been Americans, and these include not a few of the greatest names in American literature and politics during the last forty years.

I took an early part in trying to set right the misguided current of feeling which at first set strongly in England against the American Union in the great Civil War. Both on the ground that slavery was the institution really fought for by the South, and also on the ground of the right of the American Union to fight for its single nationality, I felt that the "North" was in the right, and that the cause of civilization was at stake in the success of the Union.

My feeling and opinion on the Irish question of Home Rule is founded on the same convictions. Irish Home Rule is—in one well-known word—"Secesh." The profession to keep unity under a common crown is insincere with all the Irish leaders, and it is inspired by ignorance among the few who are sincere in it.

Under the united constitution the crown has no power except through a parliamentary majority and an executive cabinet dependent thereupon. A united nationality cannot be maintained with one crown unsupported by one supreme parliament.

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

The Gladstonian proposal is to set up in Ireland a separate parliament with a separate executive government, through which alone the powers of the crown could be exerted, except on a few enumerated subjects. Even supposing that those excepted powers could be maintained against the constant inevitable pressure to break down the walls of the limitation, they would be useless to defend the individual subjects, or citizens, of the Irish people from legislative attacks upon life, liberty, and property.

Even in the case of our large colonies the veto power of the crown over the legislation of the colonial parliaments is practically *nil*. It may delay, it may compel, reconsideration, but anything more than this would be resented, and a real veto could only be enforced at the cost of separation. The pretext that the new Irish Parliament would be only "statutory" is transparent sophistry. The abstract right of an originally imperial parliament to repeal all or any of its own enactments is a purely theoretical and visionary right. It would be practically impotent to repeal any of the acts conferring responsible government on our larger colonies. The same abstract doctrine was the doctrine on which the taxation of the New England colonies was defended by the ministers of George III., and it is even now impossible to say that their egregious folly in that policy was, in the strict sense of that word, illegal.

This pretext, therefore, is futile. In the act of creating a new parliament for Ireland we shall undoubtedly divest ourselves of all power to take back what we have once given, except, of course, at the cost of civil war, and to this alternative we should be unquestionably driven if the anticipations are fulfilled, in which I fully share. Sooner or later, such antagonisms would be developed that Great Britain would be compelled to restore and assert her national unity, and her imperial authority, by force. And this remedy was actually contemplated by some of the Gladstonian leaders when they defended the proposal of 1886. Sir William Harcourt, in his speech on that bill, frankly owned that he could not say he was confident as to the use to which the Irish leaders would put their newly acquired powers. But he pointed out, that if the worst came to the worst, we should have more than thirty millions against less than five millions, to secure a remedy. This was a threat of the use of force very thinly disguised.

Americans, therefore, may depend upon it that we feel that

we are fighting the same battle they fought against "Secession," and against the breaking up of our national unity.

But then there is more than this behind. Our colonists carry with them all the principles and doctrines of the common law of England respecting all the rights and mutual obligations of men to each other in society. It was the same with the older colonies now constituting the American Union. The colonists were not anarchists. They kept that rich inheritance of law which was their own inheritance as much as it is our inheritance at home. Accordingly when the Union was formed, each of the colonies kept this inheritance, and guarded it by a few general clauses in the constitution; few and general as these clauses were they were enough for the purpose then—because there was no party existing which called in question the fundamental principles of all civilized society. But when the great slavery rebellion was suppressed the need was felt of strengthening the clauses by more significant additions; and now under the shield of your constitution every citizen of your Union is guaranteed against the loss of life, liberty and property, by any anarchical legislation of individual States.

It may well seem incredible to Americans when I tell them that in the Gladstonian scheme of Home Rule for Ireland no such security was given for the freedom of the individual citizen, as is thus provided in your constitution. All property and all liberty was left absolutely at the mercy of the Irish Parliament. So monstrous a proposition had never been made before by any statesman.

It is not therefore the fear of religious persecution in any direct form that has given voice to the indignation of Ulster. They fear the loss of all that makes life tolerable to free and civilized men. The majority in the new Irish Parliament are sure to be men who have avowed principles and desires which are fatal to all industrial progress or to the secure enjoyment of any property. I regard the voice of Ulster, which represents the greatest industrial centre in the whole island, as the voice also of the minority over the whole of the rest of Ireland. They dread the loss of all those securities for individual liberty and for property which is accorded under the American Constitution to all its citizens in all the States.

I understand that in the United States the charter of the old

English sovereigns which were given in the (ten) colonies are the recognized title deeds of much property all over the country. It may have passed from hand to hand many times ; but the original title has been the fountain and the source of all security. Americans have thus secured for themselves a perfect continuity in the enjoyment of all the liberties and securities on which society reposes in England. All their later legislation has gone upon similar lines, and spoliation has been impossible. Compare this with the prospects in Ireland. Many of the Irish nationalist leaders are pure anarchists on all questions connected with property: and some of them have avowed their intention to treat as waste paper all titles to property coming from English sovereigns or parliaments. The Gladstonian scheme of Home Rule made no provision against such a danger as this. There was no grand declaration such as you have in your constitution, in favor of the sacredness of contracts, or of the sacredness of property in all its forms.

The assertion, therefore, that in their determined resistance to such a fearful revolution the people of Ulster are merely seeking to maintain an old religious "ascendancy" over their Catholic fellow citizens, is an assertion which can only be described as an infamous falsehood. I do not myself fear any direct form of religious persecution. The day for that is gone by ; but in many parts of Ireland powers of plunder would undoubtedly be given to local bodies in which priests would reign supreme over an ignorant, superstitious, and dependent population of peasants, and of anarchical fanatics who may be of any religion or of none.

Let the American people clearly understand that Mr. Gladstone proposed to invest the Irish Parliament with power far more extensive than that which your constitution gives to any State, although, as regards those States, there never has been, nor is there now, any serious danger of such powers being abused as they certainly would be in Ireland.

Let me warn Americans of another thing to be kept in mind. They must not trust the accuracy of Mr. Gladstone's assertions about the past history of Ireland. All his utterances have been, at the least, one-sided and partisan in character. Very often they have been in absolute defiance of the facts. For example, he has lately represented his scheme as one which merely proposed to restore to Ireland some limited share of the power of self-government

which she had once enjoyed, and of which she was deprived at the Union. The fact is that Ireland never has had a Parliament with one-tenth of the enormous power he would have given under his scheme of 1886. During all the middle ages Ireland had no parliament at all, in the modern sense of the word. The body which had the name was not a parliament representing all Ireland, but merely a local council representing a small area round Dublin called "The Pale," which was an area mainly peopled by the Norman and Anglo-Saxon "Colonists." It never did represent the great mass of the Celtic people. Since the Reformation what professed to be the Irish Parliament was representative, practically, of the Protestants only; and when, in a moment of imperial weakness, Grattan wrung from England a parliament nominally independent, that parliament retained its exclusive character of a purely Protestant assembly. And even in this character its "independence" was a farce, because it had no executive, and every bill it passed, which was disapproved of by the Imperial Government, was instantly disallowed. In affairs which may be called municipal they had some power, and very badly they used it. Much of the legislation they adopted was "protectionist" to a degree which no party in the United States would promote. Bounties on corn led to the breaking up of the most valuable pastures, and to this day the exhausting effects of their foolish legislation tells upon the agricultural industry of Ireland.

I mention Mr. Gladstone's misrepresentations on the subject of Irish history merely to give a specimen of what I mean. The same tone of inflated fable about Irish history colors every speech he makes, and if it were possible to say that it represents even an approximation to the truth, it would leave us in bewilderment how he never discovered all this till he was past 75 years of age, and how he, even up to that age, denounced those Irishmen who held similar language as the excuse for their violent and revolutionary remedies. It is in vain to go back to Irish history to establish any real connection between the long miseries of the country and the English invasion, or the later English colonizations. Montalembert, the noblest representative of the French Catholic laity in our time, has recorded in his beautiful book on the "Monks of the West" the impression made upon him by his readings in Irish history. The early Celtic Church took a noble part in the missionary work of Western Christianity. But for

that golden age of Irish history we must go back some 1,300 years. Even then the Celtic Church had incurable vices of constitution. It was as "tribal" as the Celtic clans. It joined and stimulated all their barbarous intertribal wars. The monastic bodies fought with each other, and slaughtered each other, and wasted each other's lands continually. No civilized law existed in the country, except the law of England, in the small area of the Pale. The murderous conflicts which were continuous for many centurie desolated the country and decimated the population. It is the grossest of all historical delusions that the miseries of Ireland have been due to external causes. They were due to the utter absence of civilizing institutions; aud that again was due to the fact that Ireland was never conquered as England was conquered. No race superior in organization ever made itself complete master of the country. In England we are now all proud of "the Conquest." It was a great step in our progress. The poorer Irish longed to be admitted to the benefits of English law. But the Celtic chiefs and the half-Celticized Norman lords preferred their own tribal usages, because these gave them more complete power over the people.

The most striking calamity which has ever happened to any modern people was the Irish famine of 1846-7. In one sense of the word, it was the fault of nobody. That is to say, it was due to causes the result of which no man foresaw. Nevertheless, those causes were exclusively connected with habits peculiarly Irish. I mean the habit of contentment with a very low standard of life, of occupying and cultivating the ground in small patches continually more and more subdivided, and producing chiefly, almost only, a crop which turned out to be singularly precarious. Nobody foresaw that precariousness. But the precariousness of the potato did not starve thousands in England or in Scotland, because the Irish habits of occupation had long been superseded by more civilized methods of holding and cultivating land. The enormous multiplication of the population of Ireland between 1798 and 1846, an increase from four and a half millions to above eight millions, did not show any political misgovernment. Men do not thus multiply under bad government. What it did show was bad economic conditions, and these can be traced with certainty and precision to the survival in Ireland of semi-barbarous habits, which were peculiarly Irish. Yet the great calamity of

the Irish famine is continually charged by the Irish orators upon the English government, with which it had nothing whatever to do.

What Ireland wants now is peace and the reign of law. All grievances have been removed. Such was the emphatic declaration of Mr. Gladstone himself in 1885. Nothing has happened to justify his retreat from this great confession. Parliamentary convenience, and nothing else, has led to his passionate retractions, and his appeals to ignorance in support of his new schemes.

I have written this, *currente calamo*. But I wish my American friends to understand that it is on principles well understood among them, and which they consider dear in their own constitution, that so many here are determined to resist and oppose to the uttermost the anarchical attempt to disintegrate the United Kingdom—just as they resisted the attempt to break up the United Republic in the interests of slavery and secession.

ARGYLL.

THE SHUDDER IN LITERATURE.

BY JULES CLARETIE.

THE tragic fortune of Guy de Maupassant, one of the young masters of our literature, has drawn attention to the mysterious bonds which attach the literary creator to his creation, and the question has been asked whether the artist does not become unbalanced in choosing strange, cruel, odd, or fantastic subjects,—whether, finally, the shudder or the terror which he wishes to excite in others, does not affect him first, before moving his readers.

The question would not very directly concern M. Guy de Maupassant, who has of his own will touched only upon sane and vigorous subjects, overflowing with the sap of humanity, if in the work of the author of "Une Vie" and "Pierre et Jean" there were not to be found among other tales, such as "La Peur," a disquieting and mysterious study, "Le Horla," that morbid analysis of a psychological state, that journey after the discovery of an invisible force, of a new and redoubtable Being, the Horla; the Horla, who is to succeed man—the Horla, an immortal creature coming into the heritage of "him who dies daily."

Certainly, in re-reading this story by the poor fellow who is now shut up in the asylum of Doctor Blanche—who, intoxicated as he has ever been with the open air and the fair fields bathed in sunlight, sees nothing, feels nothing, of spring's young caresses; in studying closely this sort of strange autobiography, one finds in the "Horla" the very beginning of the delirium that has seized upon the writer. It came about at the time when he achieved this remarkable work, at the precise moment when that which science calls the period of incubation gave place to the period of restlessness. Indeed, Guy de Maupassant had even passed through two of the states, which, in this psychosis, succeed each other mathematically; incubation, restlessness, persecution, and dementia. Poor great writer, whose

sufferings are so clearly perceived in this short tale, written like a confession, in the form of a journal :

"*May* 16.—I am decidedly ill. . . . I have constantly that frightful sensation of a threatening danger, that dread of a coming misfortune, or of approaching death.

"*May* 18.—I have just consulted my doctor. He found my pulse rapid, eye dilated, nerves vibrating, but without any alarming symptom. I am to use douches and drink bromide of potassium. . . .

"*May* 25.—I sleep . . . two or three hours . . . then a dream, no, a nightmare, seizes me. . . . Someone approaches me, looks at me, feels of me, jumps on my bed. . . . I wake in terror. . . . I light my candle. I am alone.

"*June* 2.—My condition is aggravated still more. What can be the matter with me? The bromide has no effect. . . ."

And the journal goes on thus, almost like a medical report, with a scientifically exact delineation of suffering ("A shudder seizes me, not a shivering with cold, but a strange chill of anguish"), up to the last line, when the author's hero—and one thinks then of the author himself—cries out: "I must kill myself!"

And while I am reading over this "Horla," to seek there for the trace, to find there the premonitions, of the misfortune that has overwhelmed M. de Maupassant, I cannot keep from seeing him again, revolver in hand, in the room at Cannet, trying to escape by suicide from that other Horla whose sinister approach he felt ; the mania of persecution.

Very certainly M. de Maupassant was haunted by I know not what delirious fancies, the terror and also the vertigo of death, the pang of the infinite, when he wrote that short, grim story which seems to us to-day so mournfully prophetic.

But it would not be exact to say that the artist who is in love with the Mystery of the Unknowable, who is attracted, and urged on by the Fantastic or by the Infinite, is necessarily condemned to a psychical condition like that of the author of the "Horla." Dementia is not the result of certain kinds of work any more than the taste for such researches and the habit of making them are the signs of any derangement whatever. An artist, a writer, can cross every *milieu*, treat every subject, without submitting to the influence of it, just as a general can cross the thick of the fight without being wounded.

It is nevertheless true that certain subjects are unwholesome, disquieting, perilous. The novelist, seated at his work-table, the

dramatic writer imagining the play which is to attract and stir the public, is inevitably constrained to a sort of auto-suggestion. They must really see their characters live and act; and, what is more, they see life as their heroes see it. There can be no really engrossing creation without this fusing of created and creator. Balzac, dying, sent them to look for Dr. Bixion, the great physician of the "Comédie Humaine!" "Only Bixion can save me! If Bixion does not come, if they do not find Bixion, I am lost!" Thus was life attached to his dream.

When the matter in question, then, is to give the reader or the spectator that sensation of anguish, that "strange shudder" of which Maupassant speaks—which is not "a shiver as of cold"—how could the author avoid condemning himself to this indefinable disturbance? The sentiment that one wishes to render must first be experienced. If the *Paradox* of Diderot is often true for the actor—and that is still a debatable point—it is not so for the man of letters. The *littérateur* proceeds in the presence of his paper as Talma (who was not of Diderot's opinion) used to proceed when he wished to make an audience shudder. The tragedian practised auto-suggestion, as we should say to-day. He forced himself to imagine that all the spectators who were there before him—everyone, without an exception—had been in a sense decapitated, and that, in place of the countenance which he really saw, each bore a skull on his shoulders. Yes, a skull, with the eye-sockets empty and the jaws without gums—like the skulls that the grave-diggers in "Hamlet" tumble about with their spades. And, submitting to this ghastly illusion, forcing himself to believe that he was playing the tragedy before an assembly of skeletons, like those visions of dead monks that are to be seen at Palermo or in the Capucine galleries at Rome, Talma really experienced a profound terror; and in feeling it, shaken with a horror that had been an effort of the will, he communicated this very shudder, this terror, this impression of fear, to all that house, to all those crowds of spectators. There was, as it were, a phenomenon of repercussion, at once artistic and physiological. Talma shuddered because he really *saw* what he wished to see,—skeletons; and those false skeletons, those flesh-and-blood spectators, shuddered in their turn because they *saw*, not Talma playing Orestes, but Orestes himself, Orestes distracted, Orestes wild with fear, Orestes pursued by the Furies.

I do not know of any example of artistic auto-suggestion more striking and more curious than that. M. Mounet-Sully is a little after the same order, and I recollect that at the dress rehearsal of "Hamlet" he was late. The stage was waiting. I sent to have him summoned by the call-boy. He returned in a moment and told me that M. Mounet-Sully could not come down from his dressing-room then because his costume was not quite ready. "What! It was finished a week ago, that costume. It was tried on and worn. It is complete and perfect." Yes, the costume was complete, but under his doublet M. Mounet-Sully wore braces, and at the last moment he had considered that he must have black ones—*mourning braces*—because *Hamlet* was dressed from head to foot in the trappings and the suits of woe. Those lower strata of costume had annoyed him. "The public would not see them, but I should see them." This was not the auto-suggestion of Talma; but the sentiment comes from the same need—the need for the artist to believe himself the character he plays, the hero he represents.

Thus writers, and writers more than other artists, incarnate themselves in the beings whom they set in motion. Gustave Flaubert believed himself a Carthaginian while he was working on "Salammbô." I once heard M. de Goncourt say, naively enough, but in sober truth, no doubt: "I'm broken up; have just written a love scene." Hoffmann, when he invented his "Contes," had before his eyes, and even under his hand—for he placed them after the fashion of little marionettes, rough models, on his desk—the droll personages which he called up from the depths of his dream.

To sum up, all that is no more than putting into practice the old, the eternal precept of Horace: "If you want me to weep, first weep yourself." Or, since we are concerned with the shudder in literature: "If you want me to shudder, begin by shuddering." I can well believe that Edgar Poe was not very calm, not laughing in "full-throated ease,"—like Alexander Dumas writing the "Mousquetaires,"—when he was summoning up the horrors of the Rue Morgue and the frightful, mathematically ferocious torment of the "Pendulum." And by what likeness of sentiments, or, rather, what community of sensations, was Charles Baudelaire—who revealed Poe to France—drawn towards the genius of the American author? Victor Hugo's saying to Baudelaire, after the

publication of the "Fleurs du Mal," has often been quoted: "*Vous avez créé un frisson nouveau.*" It was precisely this new shudder which Charles Baudelaire found, and was delighted with, in Edgar Poe. There was in him an echo, so to say, a refraction, a repercussion, of Baudelaire's own humor.

Medicine—or at least Hysten, in his dictionary—defines *le frisson* as "an unequal and irregular trembling which precedes fever." This trembling is exactly what follows the perusal of some extraordinary tale of Poe's, of some *poésie macabre* by Baudelaire. There is I know not what artistic hysteria in the case of these remarkable men, studying with a feverish ardor "man out of tune"—to cite Baudelaire himself—"the contradiction set up between the nerves and the spirit; that strange, disturbing *something* which makes grief express itself by laughter, as death finds expression in a grin." And to this morbid derangement, which produces masterpieces among its other manifestations—as certain maladies of plants give their flowers more exquisite colors—these seekers after the shudder added the analysis of "all that element of imagination which floats about the nervous man and leads him to evil." I am still quoting from Baudelaire, and, in very truth, all that element of the imagination of which he speaks is precisely what Maupassant pursued in his brain-sick visions; it is the invisible, the infinite, the "Horla."

The imaginary floats, moreover, about humanity, like the atoms in the air it breathes. The fantastic, the *macabre*, the mystery, the shudder, surround us, constrain, master us. There is no need of being a Baudelaire to meet the disquieting, the morbid, in the daily course of life. Every man who, returning from a ball or from the play, has found himself alone on coming home, and has by chance, in his empty room, seen his own image reflected in the glass after lamp or candle is lighted, has inevitably experienced a strange sensation of disquiet if not of terror. The feeble light sends to the mirror but a discolored reflection, pale, and enveloped in that strange fluidity which the painters call *le flou*. One sees himself in this frame only under a livid and, as it were, a phantasmatic aspect. The color seems dimmer, the glance more strange. It is no longer a reflection, it would seem, that one sees. It is an apparition; and this silent spectre looks at you with a sort of silent keenness. It would not do to remain too long before that vision and in its penumbra.

The glance at that reflection, looked at thus, in the middle of the night, has something of the attraction of an abyss. It is no longer the "Ego" who is there, immovable. It is the ghost of the "Ego," the shudder, the intangible, the invisible, the "Horla," the horrible and eternal "Horla."

And what is proved by this terror which man feels in the face of certain mysteries of his moral destiny or his bodily sufferings, of his faith or of his intellect? What is proved by that shudder which chills us sometimes as it lifted the hair of the prophet Ezekiel? That humanity, however much in love it may be with fact, with brute obvious fact, however much it may be swept along in the train of science, has always the need, the thirst for something of *the beyond*, which is sometimes the consoling utterance of eternal poetry—poetry, with all its caresses, its seduction, its enthusiasm, its pity—sometimes the sombre gulf, the black hole of madness!

All the unquiet souls, all the troubled brains of this close of the century, demand *the beyond*, seek it and summon it. One of the most remarkable of the naturalistic romancers of these latter days, M. J. K. Huysmans, wrote not long ago a book entitled "La-Bas," and in this "over there" he recounted all the mysteries of certain strange associations, groups of the unbalanced seeking "the beyond" in the dark practices of the black mass.

I know not whether the black mass has many devotees in this year of grace 1892. To be quite candid, I do not believe that it has. M. Huysmans has put into the work, I fancy, more of invention than of certified fact. But what is certain is that the mystery, the unknown, the *occult*—to use just the word—counts decidedly a large number of adepts. It is a significant movement, too, which draws so many people at the present day towards that other shudder, which I shall call the shudder of magic. The blame of it rests with materialism. After its extremes of bestiality an idealistic reaction was inevitable. This idealism merely becomes excessive in its turn, and we see the Magi born again. The French spirit is termed Chaldean, though only in exceptional instances, to be sure; and the Sar Peladar, who professes in his stories a sort of odd, magic Catholicism,—the Sar, who is one of the recent curiosities of Paris, only appears as a phenomenon and amazes with his eccentricity much more than he attracts by

his talent, which is nevertheless real, interesting, and not to be denied.

It is none the less true that this taste for occultism has made progress. Magic has special libraries and accredited romancers; and it has just made a recruit in the person of M. Gilbert Augustin Thierry, nephew of the illustrious author of the "Recits Merovingiens." Again it is proved that humanity does not live by bread alone, and the discoveries of science do not satisfy its appetite. Mystery is still necessary, will ever be necessary to it; and this renewal of occultism is a strange symptom in a country and at a period which have produced those true magi, Pasteur and Berthelot.

Science, moreover, must share in this taste for the unreal, in this love of the shudder, just as in a conflagration one makes part of the fire. Forever will man take pleasure in being afraid, in subjecting himself to fear for its own sake. "I am afraid of nothing so much as of fear," said Montaigne. He was right. But the love of fear, the taste for the shudder, is with most men a little in the nature of coquetry with the infinite, a sort of flirtation with the greatest of terrors. The child shudders at its nurse's tales, the man at ghost-stories, the woman at narrations of serpents. It is the contribution paid to human weakness. And then we brave this wholly literary shudder, and seem to be rather heroic for having done so.

It would be inexact, when all is said, to affirm that there are not in life strange problems, of which the solution escapes us. Among these are telepathic transmissions, and I could cite many others. I repeat, then, that it is this *unknowable* which draws unquiet spirits, like Baudelaire, Maupassant, and so many others, and brings about the shudder in literature, and they are not all of the unbalanced order—these disturbed spirits. They are curious, no doubt, and taken with the clear-obscure of human brains—if I may so say,—but they are not diseased.

The two most disturbing tales in the French literature of these last thirty years were written by a man with a healthy, gay mind of the ordinary French type. They are "Pierrot," the account of a neuropathic actor who cuts the throat of a rival while playing a pantomime, and "Cain," which relates the fortunes of an assassin, on whose lips the atrocious, last grin of his victim appears, like a convulsion. Now, the author is Henri Rivière, the com-

mandant Rivière, shot at Tonquin, whose beautiful head—a jesting look all the while on the face—was carried through the villages at the end of one of the pikes of the Pavillons-Noirs. Let literature, be it said in parenthesis, invent a dénouement more sinister than that, or better calculated to cause a shudder!

A writer who died young and is unknown to fame—Charles Barbara his name was—who was contemporary with Charles Baudelaire and was his friend, once wrote a novel which I regard as a masterpiece of this special sort, disturbing and at the same time attractive. It is "L'Assassinat du Pont Rouge." There again physiology is blended with adventure, for what is necessary to the seeming truth of the fantastic is that it be possible. Prosper Mérimée, in "Lokes," and in the "Venus à d'Ille," had achieved the *explicable fantastic.* The story told by Charles Barbara is that of a poor family who, having as a guest a rich man from a distant place, killed him and carried his body to the Seine, at a point near the Pont Rouge. The murderers, in possession of the stolen fortune, and being unable to spend it in Paris, exiled themselves, and took their departure for America, I think. There they meant to live happily ever after—their crime seeming to them no more than a sort of nightmare, driven away by the daylight. But suddenly remorse took shape, and incarnated itself in a child, which—ferocious circumstance!—had the features, the gestures, the very voice of the murdered, who had been dragged down there over the river banks. And grizzly enough was this *tête-a-tête* of the murderers face to face with the incarnation of their victim, which kept growing in their own son.

This new edition of the ghost of Banquo is one of the most striking examples that can be given of the shudder in literature. And with what genius and mastery did William Shakespeare manage this shudder! Hamlet and his visionary fears, Macbeth and his trembling remorse, Lady Macbeth and the spot of blood, King Lear terrified at the crazy wit of the fool, the tumult of the storm! Ah, this mystery, this unknown, this Horla, as the unhappy one called it, who wished to die in order to escape its horrors,—all who think have been tormented by it; and Charles Nodier, the most knowing of men, spoke shiveringly of Smarra to Victor Hugo, who afterwards found the shudder for himself on the island of Guernsey while he was tipping tables and asking them questions in the company of Madame Emile de Girardin.

But in the time of the romantics like Hugo and Nodier the shudder was not born, as it is to-day, of the problems of physiology, but of the mysteries of the imagination. The "Contes Noirs" of romanticism have nothing to do with the scientifically studied hallucination of a Poe, a Maeterlinck, or an Ibsen. In the time of Charles Nodier, and of the Illyrian tales published by Mérimée under the pseudonym of Hyacinth Maylarovitch, there were only vampires, sorcerers, and bronco-laques. The thirties found them believing firmly in the vampires of the *Guzla*, in this sceptical country of France, where Voltaire had written in the previous century: "I declare (apropos of vampires) that in Paris and in London there were stock jobbers, farmers of the revenue, men of affairs, who sucked the blood of the people in broad day-light; but they were not dead, although they were rotten."

Charles Nodier collected most of the tales and legends then in fashion, in a book not to be found now,—a little book bearing title "Infernalia," which does not appear in his complete works. They are no more than old wives' tales, puerile stories of apparitions. "La Nonne Sanglante," "Esprit du Chateau d'Egmont," are as novel as any of them. I find among the number a pretty legend enough, which to-day would cause a smile rather than a shudder. It is called "The Endless Horse."

"I have always loved travelling," says Nodier; "whether on horseback or on foot I am always traversing mountains and valleys. One evening, towards dark, overcome with fatigue, I said aloud: 'If I had a horse, I should be very happy.' Scarcely had I uttered this wish when a rider appeared and said to me: 'You seem very tired, sir, and you have still three leagues to make. If you care to avail yourself of the croup of my horse, it is wholly at your service.' I hesitated. Nevertheless, necessity forced me to accept, and there I was behind the rider. We had not gone five hundred paces when a second rider presented himself. The same offer was made and accepted. Soon a third, a fourth, a fifth, a sixth, at last a twelfth, is in line, and the horse lengthened himself out to make room for the last comer. For a long time fear held possession of me; I did not dare breathe, and was more dead than alive. But what was to become of me when I saw that the cursed creature went like lightning, and that it took a new road. Ah! heaven, cried I to myself, our Lord was in the same company in which we are, and the thirteenth was Judas!"

Thereupon the first traveller called upon the name of Jesus, and—like Mephistopheles recoiling before the sword with its handle in the shape of the cross—the other travellers disappeared, the endless horse was reduced to the ordinary dimensions, and the

traveller, who had run the risk of being carried off to the Witches' Sabbath, found himself safe and sound in the road, at the same place where he had seen the rider appear.

What was noteworthy in these tellers of "contes noirs" is that they did not believe a word of the stories they vended. They worked, smiling, to make others shudder. They had imagination; they had not faith. After having collected so many adventures that were full of terror, Charles Nodier added, as a conclusion to his "Infernalia," these ironical lines:

"Because some stories bearing a certain character of truth have appeared in this volume, it is not necessary on that account to believe them. Ought one, indeed, to believe a person who has seen supernatural things alone? And in all the apparitions there are no witnesses whose testimony carries conviction."

There is not a great difference, again, between these romantic story-tellers and the physiological writers of to-day. These latter believe firmly in what they write because—I repeat—what they write has been scientifically proved. The fantastic, in our time, does not take refuge in Valachian tales and stories of vampires: it is nearer us. It is easily to be met at the Salpetrière, where hypnotic suggestion makes us touch with the finger of the flesh impossibilities that would have seemed montebanks' tricks to the diabolical Voltaire and the worthy Nodier.

Literature is on the border of science, draws inspiration from it, and finds in the marvels of physiology *motifs* of disquietude and fear, an unpublished shudder, in fact, to speak a little after the manner of Victor Hugo. Charles Baudelaire certainly had an influence on this particular movement. I hear him still, telling us with a grimace not to be forgotten: "I adore Wagner. [He had been one of the first to defend him in Paris.] But the music I prefer is that of a cat hung up by his tail outside of a window, and trying to stick to the panes of glass with its claws. There is an odd grating on the glass which I find at the same time strange, irritating, and singularly harmonious." I do not doubt that there was an element of pose, a dandyism of ferocity, in his inventions. But, after all, Baudelaire, who died without speaking out, could be sincere. He paid for that sincerity with a part of his brain.

M. Maurice Maeterlinck, the author of "L'Intruse"—that invisible Death which is felt everywhere, which is divined roaming

about the house—and of the "Aveugles," that awesome study in black (if I may use the phrase), that drama of shadow—M. Maurice Maeterlinck, the Belgian writer, seems a "Baudelaire" of another kind. There is, I think, this same inspiration in such a drama as the strange and disquieting work of Ibsen entitled "La Dame de la Mer," in which the power of the human glance takes on as much importance as even the darkness and the night in the "Aveugles" of M. Maeterlinck. But, to keep to our French literature, Charles Baudelaire left two disciples, who seek, as he sought, the shudder of modern life. These are M. Paul Verlaine and M. Maurice Rollinat, the one a sort of rural dreamer wandering among desert fields, sombre woods, and old, abandoned graveyards, the other taking over Paris from hospital bed to hospital bed his dark, archangelic spirit, and the poignant lamentations of a rheumatic Bohemian.

Maurice Rollinat is so much and so closely the disciple of Baudelaire that he has put into music the poems of his master, for M. Rollinat is musician as well as poet. He has published "Six Mélodies" after the poems of Baudelaire, and nothing is more poignant, more agonizing, than the music composed by him on the "Madrigal Triste," by the author of the "Fleurs du Mal." Music strange, enervating and mournful, the notes of which fall one by one, like hot tears, and make the hearer think of the broken harmonies of the Hungarian "Czardas."

And when M. Rollinat recites his verses or chants his music, he causes a shudder to creep over the soul of the listeners. With his thin face, sharp voice, and hair falling in tangled locks over a sombre forehead, the poet, before he has spoken, gives the impression of all that is ghastly. He was very much the fashion in Paris all winter, in the recitation of his "Neuroses." Only the other day he published a volume in which this sad note, the literary shudder, is found again in an intense and attractive guise. It is *Nature*. He especially seeks in this book the impalpable, the invisible—everything there is in things of *the beyond*. The singing of the wind is heard in it, the fantastic element, rising and falling; he sees the viper, stuffed with venom, sunning itself:

> *"Et la bête choisit un coin tiède, et s'y lave,*
> *Pour cuver son venin que le printemps renoue."*

He asks himself whether the reptile, the instrument of death, which he stumbles upon, rolling its envenomed body round an

immense poisonous toadstool, has not a right to life just as much as the passing butterfly. He stops, and, after the burial of some poor person, gazes at the grave-digger, living alone among the rain-washed crosses. . . .

> *"Et, pelle en main, cet homme incarne le destin,*
> *Quand il s'en va combler dans la nuit; déja brune,*
> *La fosse de six pieds qui baille sous la lune."*

The inspiration of the "Fleurs du Mal" is visible.

We have there the echo of Baudelaire,—or, rather, a rustic Baudelaire, a Baudelaire of the Berrichon fields,—for M. Rollinat is of George Sand's country. He is the son of this *Malgache*, of whom there is question in the "Letters d'un Voyageur," and his poetry justly makes us think of that letter of Madame Sand's in which she describes the feeling that sometimes possesses a group of men when the autumn wind sends down the high chimney its lugubrious plaint, sounding like a human voice. And it is then that the shudder seizes on people, with that strange cry which is like the groaning of the infinite.

M. Paul Verlaine, for his part, is a more Parisian and less healthy disciple of Baudelaire than M. Rollinat. There is something of paradox in his morbid inspiration. M. Rollinat gives us the sensation of the recesses of deep woods, black and terrifying. M. Verlaine renders for us the smell of taverns, in which melancholy is tainted with absinthe, of hospitals where suffering and agony fill the folds of the white curtains with the microbes of former deaths. But—once more let it be said—both derive their information from Baudelaire, and their verses would have delighted the author of the "Femmes Damnées." They have kept the shudder of the master.

I must end. All these mournful or ghastly verses, these psycho-physiological researches, these evocations of the infinite, the intangible, the "Horla," these appeals addressed to I know not what obscure element lying at the bottom of the gulf,—are they harmful or wholesome? Is literature profiting from these *neuroses*. Is not this appetite for the unknown bad for both writer and reader? Will not the man who plays with the chimera be devoured by it, even as he who kills with the sword must perish by the sword? No, the shudder in literature does not lead of necessity to the loss of mental balance. A lesion of the brain is necessary before dementia attacks us. But, to be candid, one

does not dabble in psychical mysteries with more impunity than one manipulates the strange chemical substances from which death can proceed on an explosion of picrate. Every mystery is attractive, like a problem, but dangerous, too, like everything that is without bottom and productive of vertigo. The abyss has its loadstone, the void its magnet. The shudder is one of those forms of literature which are subtle and yet naïve. Fear, which is a pain to children, becomes a pleasure for the *blasés*, a caress like any other caress. It has its dangers, like morphine, like absinthe, like opium. I do not know why these stupefying drugs make me think of the literature of those who are in love with the shudder.

What is certain is that darkness, half-light, mystery, anguish —which have their powerful and morbid charm—are exactly opposed to the taste, the temper of mind, the clearness which so long furnished forth the seduction of our France. I am well aware of all there is to be said for *esprit*, and all there is to be said for mystery. Mystery is profound, divine, and wit is merely a light and superficial gift. But there is poison in mystery, as in the viper of Rollinat ; and wit has wings, as has the butterfly which floats high in the sunlight.

To sum up, the poetry of night—of darkness, of phantoms—is only a form of fear,—a bad dream, as it were. I prefer to it the poetry of the broad day and the open air. The visions of the insomniac, the dreams of the sick, are not worth the clear inventions of the brain in the fulness of its waking strength. One does not necessarily fall into the abyss because one goes along the edge. No ; but one should not play with suffering any more than one should trifle with love.* It is not said to-day for the first time, "Deep calleth unto deep."

JULES CLARETIE.

* "*On ne Badine pas avec l'Amour*," — title of play by Alfred de Musset.

OUR RECENT FLOODS.

BY J. W. POWELL, LL.D., DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

DURING the past season floods have devastated many valleys in the United States. The Mississippi and most of its tributaries have poured tides of destruction over their adjacent lands. These floods extended over an area so widespread, involved so many river valleys, were poured down so many mountain sides and hill sides, and presented so many characteristics, that they cannot be succinctly and fully described within the inexorable limits of a magazine article. The destruction was equal to that of some memorable wars. In the northeastern portion of the flood invasion, on a tributary of the Alleghany at the sources of the Ohio, renowned for its quiet beauty, the moloch of fire joined with the dragon of flood in the work of destruction. In the rocks of northwestern Pennsylvania there are reservoirs of oil, stored by nature so long ago that years furnish no measure of the period intervening between that and the present time. From this store modern enterprise had gathered the oil into tanks, that the powers of fire might be used for industrial purposes,—smelting ores, driving engines, lighting cities, and warming cottage homes. But the flood came and these fossil fires stored by man in artificial reservoirs were turned loose to join with the floods in the work of destruction, so that flood and flame reveled as rival demons in the work. Thus tragedy joined hands with tragedy. The fire was but an accident of the flood, and the flood of the little Pennsylvania valley was but one of hundreds that devastated regions of country widely spread through much of the drainage basin of the Mississippi.

The amount of water which circulates through the air is immense. From year to year the total evaporation from land

and sea, and the total precipitation from the heavens to the surface, must be equal. The total amount of evaporation, and of consequent rainfall, is not exactly known, but the approximate amount is pretty well made out. The rate of evaporation has been measured in very many places scattered over the earth, especially in Europe and the United States, There are some places in the United States where evaporation is not more than 20 inches annually, but there are other regions, as in the lower valley of the Colorado River, where it is more than eight feet. These facts well illustrate the variability of evaporation.

But more attention has been given to the measurement of rainfall than to the measurement of evaporation. Like the latter, it is variable, ranging from less than an inch to more than 50 feet annually. On the Mohave desert the rainfall is about three inches, and in various portions of the United States this increases to 10, 20, 30, 50 inches, until in the northwestern part of the State of Washington there is a rainfall of 125 inches in a single year. On the peninsula of India the rainfall varies from 74 to 255 inches annually, and at Cossyah, north of Calcutta, there is said to be an annual rainfall of 610 inches. Thus rainfall, like evaporation, varies from land to land between great extremes. In general, there is a decrease of rainfall from the equator to the poles. The following table is a fair approximation of the amount of rainfall in zones of latitude receding from the equator :

AVERAGE ANNUAL RAINFALL IN DIFFERENT LATITUDES.

Latitude.	Inches of rain.
0	100
20	80
30	60
40	40
50	30
60	20
70	10
80	5

The average rainfall for the entire surface of the earth is about four feet. The entire annual rainfall upon the earth is estimated at about 152,000 cubic miles. This is sufficient to fill Lake Erie nearly 900 times or Lake Superior 50 times. These figures give a fair idea of the amount of water which is anually carried to the clouds and discharged upon the earth, and of the energy exerted in the work by the heat of the sun.

It has been seen that the rainfall is very unequally distributed over the surface of the earth ; that some lands reap a great har-

vest from the clouds, others a meager supply. But such inequality does not produce floods. If the rainfall were distributed equally through the days, or even through the months of the year, there would be no disastrous floods. Regular rainfall produces regular channels competent to carry away all the water. There are floods in arid lands and in humid lands alike. One of the floods last year, which made a lake in a desert, was in a region of minimum rainfall. It is the concentration of rain in brief intervals of time that brings disastrous floods. In France 31 inches of rain have been observed to fall in thirty-four hours; in Genoa, 30 inches in 24 hours; in Gibraltar, 33 inches in thirty-six hours; near Bombay, 24 inches in one night; on the Khasi in India, 150 inches have fallen in five successive days. There are on record in the United States several instances of a fall of five or six inches in two or three hours. A great rainfall may extend over a great area of country, but oftener extreme rainfalls are limited to small districts, sometimes to only a very few square miles. Thus there are great regional floods and very local floods.

Can man control these mighty powers? Man cannot hide the earth from the sun, and its powers of lifting the waters are beyond his control. By the heat of the sun and the revolution of the earth winds are set in motion, and they cannot be stayed by the puny power of man. Under these conditions the clouds gather and dance in aërial revelry and rain where they will. The energy exhibited in one shower that sweeps over a county of meadows is greater than the power of the falls of Niagara.

But rains are not solely powers of destruction; they are the fertilizers of the soil, the beneficent harbingers of harvest. Forests bourgeon in their bounty, meadows luxuriate in their gifts, orchards blossom in their balm, vineyards quaff their nectar for a transformed vintage. Thus there are rains of delight and storms of terror. Where storms prevail jungles grow, where storms fail deserts are found, and desert and jungle alike are enemies of man. So man longs for gentle and frequent rains.

It has been the dream of mankind to control the clouds. Savage men dance for rain, and beat drums, and deck altars with the plumes of birds, and smoke pipes to create mimic clouds, and make offerings of meal to the wind gods, and perform long dramatic ceremonies as they pray for rain. All savage tribes thus seek to govern the clouds with terpsichorean worship. Barbaric men

still keep up their dancing and their singing and their ceremonies, but to them they add costly offerings—libations of wine and hecatombs of beasts and human sacrifices—thus conjoining sacrificial with terpsichorean worship. Early civilized men still perform ceremonies, still make sacrifices, but to them they add a newer form of supplication in confessions of belief in the power, goodness, and glory of the rain gods. But terpsichorean, sacrificial, and fiducial agencies fail to change the desert into the garden or to transform the flood-storm into the refreshing shower. Years of drought and famine come, and years of flood and famine come, and the climate is not changed with dance, libation, or prayer.

Now great is the name of science! In the elder day if a man would palm upon the world an elixir of life or a universal panacea he did it in the name of religion. To the skirts of religion all humbug and villainy clung. In modern times religion has shaken off these vampires, and they now cling to science. If any man has an elixir or a panacea or any other monstrous humbug he clings to the garments of science, and claims to have discovered some great scientific principle. For it must be scientific or it is nothing.

It is a glorious sight to see a man in the possession of an idea, for the great idea exalts the man; but it is a sorry sight to see an idea in the possession of a man. Some ideas are like devil-fish, they wind themselves about their victims, who writhe in agony and exclaim: "How great is this idea, it is science itself!" Now and then in modern civilization some man in the gripe of an idea howls about the scientific principle which he has discovered. Among the ailments of life rheumatism and fits are the ills over which he most often claims control, and among the powers of nature earthquakes and storms are the ones over which he most often claims control. The man in the possession of the earthquake fiend we have all known, and the man in the possession of the storm-devil idea is not uncommon. There are those who would control the rains and change the climate by boring artesian wells; there are those who would control the clouds by planting trees and preserving forests; there are those who would change the climate by building railroads, and there are those who would control the rains by bombarding the heavens with popgun balloons. When you meet with one of these men you may always know that a devil-fish has

seized him. Such errors often have a subtle power over the mind by reason of the modicum of truth which they contain.

There are districts in various parts of the world where artesian fountains may be found whose waters are a blessing to mankind, furnishing needed supplies for men and animals and sometimes for power. In arid lands they are especially beneficent, where they can be used for cultivating gardens, vineyards, and orchards. Wherever they are found they prove to be of great value. But when it is claimed, as it has been again and again, that such waters can be brought to the surface and used in irrigation and evaporated to the heavens, and that the moisture will change the climate, there is a singular misapprehension of quantitative relations. How many artesian wells would it require to furnish the water for a monthly rain? and who could prevent waters furnished to the atmosphere in this manner from drifting away with the air currents to lands where rains are not needed?

Every man loves to see trees scattered over the landscape for their beauty and for their usefulness, and there is no sadder sight than that presented by the destruction of forests by fire or wanton axemen. When the slopes of plains, hills, and mountains are denuded of forests, especially by fire, they are attacked by rains and channeled by the streams, and the fertile soils are swept away until desolation prevails. The forests annually destroyed by fire in the United States are of great extent, and values by the million are thus transformed into smoke. The planting of trees and the protection of forests are ends worthy to be attained, yet men go wild with their theories and claim that they can change climates thereby. Some minute effects on evaporation and precipitation may be possible, but such effects compared with the great powers of nature in producing rain are too insignificant to be worthy of consideration.

It is possible that when the atmosphere is charged with moisture mechanical agencies could be devised by which some small portion of the rainfall could be precipitated—a few drops over a bit of land; but making noises overhead does not bring the water up from the sea; it does not fill the dry air with moisture; and it cannot discharge from a saturated body of air such a quantity of moisture as would be of any value to thirsty fields. Before science can do anything of value to man in the control of winds and storms it must learn to control powers of a magni-

tude almost beyond human imagination. Yet here something can be done of value to the mariner and the agriculturist. Scientific men are investigating the laws of meteorology, and have already discovered much of value, so that it has become possible, and more and more practicable, to foretell meteorological conditions, and by wise prevision to avert calamity.

Can anything be done to prevent floods or to ameliorate them, or is human endeavor restricted to the work of predicting impending disaster and fleeing from it? The subject is worthy of a little further consideration.

The rain which falls upon the land so irregularly is in part evaporated and in part flows to the sea by rivers. The percentage of river-flow is quite variable in different countries. In the arid portion of the United States there are hundreds of creeks and small rivers whose waters roll out into desert sands where they are evaporated. In this region of country very little of the rainfall is carried to the sea. The great rivers are few, and the few are very small when compared with the areas drained. While thus there are extended districts from which no water runs to the sea, there are others where the river-flow is a large percentage of the rainfall.

The following table shows the proportion which the discharge bears to rainfall in several basins in the United States:

Connecticut River	63	per cent.
Croton River, N. Y.	51	" "
Sudbury River, Mass.	48	" "
All rivers of Maine, average	40	" "
Entire Mississippi, excluding Red River	25	" "
Ohio River	24	" "
Upper Mississippi	24	" "
Missouri River	15	" "
Arkansas River	15	" "
Red River, Louisiana	20	" "

From the above facts it will be seen that it is not necessary to control all the rainfall of a basin in order to control the floods of its river. Again, the river will normally take care of the greater part of its discharge. The channel itself is adequate to the task of carrying away the water of any ordinary rain. Every destructive flood is caused by the comparatively small excess of a storm which is of unusual magnitude. Thus while the quantity of water which appears in any great flood is vast, yet that which brings destruction is only the excess over the carrying capacity of the channel. The destructive waters, therefore, are but a very small percentage of the rainfall, and but a small percentage of

the river-flow. The quantities of water to be controlled and the powers to be mastered are so nearly within the conditions where human effort may be available that hydraulic engineers and geologists have again and again considered this problem, not without hope of its solution.

Let us see what the problem is, how it varies from region to region, and to what extent it is affected by the operations of man. The rivers of the earth may be divided into two classes, namely, flood-plain rivers and cañon rivers. In flood-plain rivers under conditions of great precipitation the waters rise above the channel banks to overflow the plain which descends seaward or towards the mouth of the river. In cañon streams the channels are cut so deep that the highest flood never reaches the brink of the cañon walls. There are many rivers which are flood-plain streams along parts of their courses and cañon streams along other parts of their courses. In cañon channels it is evident that human habitations and property are safe when above the flood-line, and this flood-line is always easily discernible, so that little excuse is found for those who suffer from floods under such conditions. But a great majority of rivers are flood-plain streams, and here the conditions of safety are not so readily discovered. A great river ramifies into small rivers and these ramify into creeks, and the creeks into brooks. Along the course of such a tree-of-rivers all those parts which are not cañon-reaches have flood-plains,—that is, comparatively level stretches, back from the river, on either side to the foot of the hills.

This flood-plain receives the excessive waters when the river overflows its banks, and the sediment carried by the river is deposited over the plain. This deposit makes the soil rich, and the most fertile lands of the world are along flood-plains. The whole extent of the flood-plains of any reach of a river is not usually conspicuous to the untrained eye. The lower portions are readily recognized as such by all, but the higher portions, which are submerged only by the great floods that come perhaps many years apart, are usually unrecognized by non-experts; but they are easily discovered by trained geologists, for the deposited strata are clearly differentiated from the hill strata on either side. In a great river, with its tributaries, it will be noticed that above the point where the streams are small the channels of the rivers descend abruptly, and the flood-plains on either side also descend down

stream at a comparatively high rate. But as the river grows larger the channel and the flood-plain have less declivity, until when near the sea they have but a low slope. In the small streams at the headwaters of the Ohio and in other tributaries of the Mississippi the declivities may be many feet to the mile, but the Mississippi River itself and its flood-plain on either side from the Ohio to the Gulf have a descent which is not greater than four inches to the mile. These low declivities near the sea are usually called delta plains. But the torrential plains above are not clearly demarcated from the delta plains below, torrent-stretch merging into delta-stretch; yet these two portions of any great river present very different problems.

In the torrential portion of the river's course the flood-plain is narrow; in the delta portion the flood-plain is wide. In the torrential portion the stream may be cutting its channel deeper from year to year, but in the delta portion the river can never cut its channel deeper, or, as the geologist says, corrade vertically. Wherever there is a flood-plain along the river the stream cuts its banks, or corrades laterally, in the language of the geologist. In torrential regions corrasion is thus both vertical and lateral, but in delta regions corrasion is wholly lateral. These conditions of corrasion present widely differentiated problems to the engineer. By lateral corrasion a flood-plain stream changes its course, wandering over the plain by cutting banks on one side and building banks on the other. So a river meanders back and forth through its valley as the years go on, changing its site. Where the river runs to-day a bank will be built to-morrow, and where a bank stands to-day a river channel will be cut to-morrow. In a state of nature this squirming of the river is comparatively slow, but on the first settlement of a country it is greatly accelerated. The cause may be indicated as follows: The clearing of the forests, the plowing of the fields, the opening of roads, and various other operations performed by man, greatly stimulate the wash. Detritus added to a stream in this manner chokes it, and bars and low dams are formed by the additional mud and sand. The river thus checked turns against its banks and cuts them, now on this side, now on that. The cutting of the bank loads it with more material, again to choke some reach below, and this cutting and choking of the stream and turning it from its course is repeated again and again as it makes its way to the sea.

Now as flood-plain streams are choked in this manner floods ar increased, for the water is thus sooner turned from its channel. Again, as the currents of the stream are increased, the curves of the stream are multiplied, the course of the river is lengthened, and the declivity of the channel diminished ; and so destructive floods are still further multiplied.

A time arrives when this growth in floods caused by human operations comes to an end. The new channels cut by men are lined with willows, grasses, and various other plants, and cease to wash. By higher cultivation the fields are not left exposed to destruction by rains, rills, and brooks ; and gradually man learns to clear the river channels from obstructions. In a high state of cultivation and civilization it is probable that river channels carry away the waters of floods quite as rapidly as, perhaps often more successfully than, in a state of nature.

There has grown up in this country another agency which is ultimately to affect the regimen of rivers. Its effect is already to be observed in the arid region. This comes from the utilization of waters for irrigation. It may be expected that in the near future all of the rivers of the arid region—about two-fifths of the entire area of the United States—will be controlled for purposes of irrigation ; all the flood waters will be caught and stored, and all that vast empire will be free from the threatening terrors of flood. This will not happen through any immense engineering works devised to control the rivers themselves, but it will come by controlling in detail the smaller streams that unite to make the rivers. The Missouri River and most of its tributaries on the western side will ultimately all be used for irrigation, and much relief from floods will result therefrom, to be felt even in the lower valley of the Mississippi.

Of the three great rivers that unite to form the Mississippi, namely, the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, and the Missouri, the Missouri is much the longest, but it carries a small volume of water compared with the others, so that the control of the Missouri will not so greatly affect the volume of water in the lower Mississippi. On the other hand, the Missouri supplies about nine-tenths of the detritus to the lower Mississippi, and furnishes the obstructions that choke it. Ultimately irrigation will do much to correct this flow. Irrigation is not confined to arid regions. Of late years, especially in Europe, its chief growth is in humid

regions. Mineral and other artificial fertilizers are not inexhaustible. The water which flows from the hills above is inexhaustible, and far more valuable for fertilizing purposes than any other stimulant that man has devised. For this reason it may be expected that irrigation will be practised all over the United States. The valley of the Mississippi and the multitudinous valleys of the Appalachian Mountains and the Atlantic coast are well adapted to this enterprise, and soon we shall see every farmer carrying a little stream of water upon his land, and thereby greatly multiplying the products of the soil. All this will aid in the amelioration of floods.

There is still another agency by the aid of which good agriculture produces advantageous results. Deep cultivation and underdraining create a reservoir for water wherever it is practiced. By properly cultivating the lands, so that they will not be washed away by rains and rills, and by underdraining, so that reservoirs of water will be produced wherever fields are found, and by the use of the smaller streams in irrigation, some lands will be entirely relieved of floods, other lands will have their floods diminished, and in all cases some relief will result. But all of these agencies combined will not entirely protect the world from floods ; so the engineering problems remain.

Practically three methods of protection from floods have been advocated by engineers and geologists. One is to store the surplus waters in great artificial lakes. This plan was ably advocated for the Ohio River by Ellet, the engineer who built the rams on the Mississippi River, in an elaborate publication of the Smithsonian Institution. A second method which has been advocated is to shorten the courses of rivers by straightening their channels and opening shorter outlets to the sea. A third method is the one generally adopted ; that is, the protection of flood-plains by embankments. All of these methods are expensive, and require vast engineering plans and years of heavy labor. In general, engineers seem to prefer the embankment system ; perhaps geologists are more generally inclined to the reservoir system. The merits of these several systems cannot here be discussed ; a volume would be necessary for their elucidation.

Meanwhile, is there no hope of relief from floods ? I think that a practical word of advice can be given. In the first place, the signal system of the Weather Bureau of the government

can be developed in this direction to great advantage, so that people will be more thoroughly warned of coming floods. In the second place, on the torrential streams the flood-plains should be avoided—no town, no house, no barn should ever be built upon a flood-plain. The valleys are narrow, the hills are near by, and the dangerous lands can be easily pointed out by geologists. It would be vain to say that these torrential plains should not be cultivated, for they have the best soils, but they are ever subject to inundation and can be cultivated by man only on the condition that he will pay a tax every five, ten, or fifty years in the form of a destroyed crop. Yet the lands are superior and this tax can be paid. But it is almost criminal to subject homes to the terrors of flood, and it is a wholly unnecessary risk to barns, granaries, flocks, and herds. To build towns on torrential flood-plains in face of all the warnings which history has given is a folly. Every flood-plain must some time be inundated, and every house built upon a flood-plain must some time be swept away. Years may pass without a flood, but it comes at last.

On delta flood-plains, like that of the great valley of the Mississippi, other problems are presented. This one valley is an empire in area. Its soils are sources of incalculable wealth and men will cultivate them. The belt of plain is wide and it cannot be reached from the hills. But there are elevations in the midst of the plain that can be utilized as safe sites for homes, and artificial embankments can often be made to serve a good purpose.

The great problem remains. The whole subject of rains, rivers, floods, and flood-plains demands further investigation. The first need is for accurate topographic maps ; the second need is for geological surveys by which flood-plains are outlined ; the third need is for hydraulic surveys by which the rivers are gauged and the powers to be controlled are discovered. As the facts come to light American genius will solve the problem.

J. W. Powell.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS A STRATEGIST.

BY ARCHIBALD FORBES.

II.

WEBSTER'S dictionary defines strategy as "The science of military command." It is not a severe strain on this definition, in dealing with Lincoln as a strategist, and regarding him as Commander-in-Chief of the military forces of the Union, to review his selections for the higher commands in the field. In those he was by no means uniformly happy, and this for several reasons. He was not himself a soldier; he found little guidance in antecedents; in some instances personal predilections swayed him unconsciously; in others political influences had effect; in yet others the voice of the public had to be listened to. Had not Porter injured his career by becoming the friend of McClellan, his skill and tenacity, so finely illustrated at Mechanicsville and Gaines's Mill, on the retreat to the James, and at Malvern Hill, must have raised him to high command. But for the popular prejudice against him, resulting from the opening reverse of Bull Run, for which he was not in the least to blame, and but for the undeserved calumnies of which he was the victim at the disastrous close of Pope's campaign, McDowell might well have been chosen by the President for the ultimate command of the Army of the Potomac. The selection of Burnside was exceptionally unfortunate. Throughout the war he was honest but incapable, and his "manly" assumption of the responsibility for the disaster of Fredericksburg was poor solace to the nation for the ghastly slaughter of its finest soldiery. Hooker's faults, to be noticed later, were almost virtues when compared with Burnside's incom-

petence. The shiningly successful leaders of the Civil War on the Northern side, the men whose names will go down to the ages in connection with it—Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas—made themselves what they became, rather than were selected in virtue of insight manifested by the President.

Nevertheless, it is strictly true that Lincoln in choosing his commanders, as in every other phase of his career as President, lived for the Union, endured for it, ignored himself for it, humiliated himself for it, and crowned his heroic devotion by dying for it. With him all was as nothing that did not work toward the preservation of the Union. "My paramount object in this struggle," were his memorable words to Horace Greeley, "is to save the Union, and not either to save or to destroy slavery." It was with a single eye to that paramount object that he selected his army commanders, irrespectively of their acceptability or the reverse, their devotion or the reverse, to himself.

McClellan was at once his greatest discovery and his greatest mistake. He became enraptured with the skill and genius in organization, which this bright young selection of his displayed. So imbued was he with the belief that in him he had found his heaven-born general that he allowed McClellan to obtain a certain dominance over him. In the previous article were outlined his struggles in the shackles of that dominance, which eventuated in McClellan's triumphal expedition to the lower Chesapeake. Doubts as to the "young Napoleon's" ardor for the fray were probably already in the President's mind when McClellan declined the attempt to oust Johnston from Manassas. His clamor for reinforcements, and for guns for service in the siege of Yorktown could not have dispelled that suspicion, and it must have been intensified by the delay at Williamsburg and the extreme leisure of the subsequent advance to the Chickahominy. He must have realized that Fair Oaks was not McClellan's battle, but Johnston's, since the former, three days before it, had expressed his belief that the latter was "too able" to adventure the offensive. The disillusionment must have been about completed when McClellan stated that he "was quietly closing in upon the enemy preparatory to the last struggle," and when nothing came of those leisurely preparations. How fully at length the President had found out his man stands revealed, when he was in the midst of his exertions to thwart Jackson's raid down the Valley of the Potomac, in his

curt injunction to McClellan to "attack Richmond or give up the job."

After McClellan's disastrous retreat to the James, after his exhibition of insubordination in his despatch from Savage Station, and above all on the clear evidence from the the past, that, let him be reinforced ever so strongly, he had not the resolution to make a strenuous effort to fight his way into Richmond, and was simply pigeonholed passively in a nook of the peninsula, the time had surely come for the long-suffering President in the interest of the cause to deprive him of his command. It would seem from the point of view of the present argument that for Lincoln to have refrained from this was bad strategy.

Messrs. Nicolay and Hay accredit the President with having treated McClellan with great magnanimity in appointing him to the command of the defence of Washington and to effect the reorganization of Pope's troops on the disastrous termination of that officer's campaign. They write with great frankness: "Mr. Lincoln certainly had the defects of his great qualities. His unbounded magnanimity made him sometimes incapable even of just resentments."

From familiar personal knowledge these admirable biographers had naturally much insight into the character of their great chief; and in this they have the advantage of all other commentators. Yet if my estimate of Lincoln is correct, that his sole concern was centred in the safeguarding of the Union, it would follow that there was room in his mind neither for resentments nor for magnanimity, but that with given concentration on the great end, he impartially used the tools which seemed to him best befitted to his purpose. And in this juncture McClellan was obviously the tool to use.

How resolute in a purpose on which he had once set himself was the President, is illustrated in his making this appointment in the face of the opposition of a majority of his Cabinet, four of whom went so far as to sign a written remonstrance "against McClellan's continuing in command of any army in the Union." Stanton disclaimed any responsibility for the appointment, and Chase, while full of scorn for what he considered the President's lack of spirit, nevertheless accorded him the meed of honest regard for the public weal when he wrote in his diary: "It (the appointment) is . . . prompted, I believe, by a sincere

desire to serve the country, and by a fear that should he supersede McClellan by any other commander, no advantage would be gained in leadership, but much harm in the disaffection of officers and troops."

Lincoln counted nothing humiliating to him that promised to assist the great cause for which he lived. How regardless of his own dignity was he when the sacrifice of it gave a prospect of advantage to the State is evinced by his stooping to request McClellan to exert his personal influence with his sworn allies in the high commands of the Army of the Potomac to purge themselves of the spirit of "hostility and insubordination" so openly displayed by many of the most prominent among them.

The man of whom such a service was asked could scarcely have described himself truly as going to Antietam with "a halter about his neck." Nevertheless, though he still held to him the Army of the Potomac, he had lost with the nation the mesmerism of his prestige. But fortune favored him. Pope's regiments turned out so much less demoralized than had been supposed, that McClellan's work of organization was easier and shorter than could have been anticipated. He was as assiduous in that work as ever; as ever he was slow when the march with an enemy at the end of it came to be undertaken. Rarely indeed has it been the good fortune of a general at the beginning of a campaign to find himself placed in full knowledge of his adversaries' disposition; yet the possession of that enormous advantage could not stir McClellan into prompt alacrity. His sluggishness cost the loss of the garrison of Harper's Ferry. He threw away invaluable time before taking the offensive at South Mountain; and he could have done Lee no better service than in wasting a whole long autumn day in deliberately putting his army into position for the unscientific, unpurposeful and butcherly fighting of the morrow.

Antietam was fought on the 17th of September, 1862. Not until the 26th of October did McClellan begin to cross the Potomac. During the interval of more than five weeks he had practically been immobile, while Lee quietly watched him from Winchester. During that interval he had continuously clamored for reinforcements, for reëquipment of all kinds, for supplies on supplies. He had disregarded Halleck's taunt of October 7 that in his army there was a "decided want of legs," and ignored

the President's peremptory order to move. Then on the 13th Lincoln sent him a letter so full of strategic wisdom, so informed with the alternative strategic possibilities, so charged with lucid comprehension of the opportunities, that of itself it would indicate the great President's title to be a stategist of the first order. It is too long to be quoted *in extenso*, and the extracts of which space admits do not adequately illustrate its merits as a whole.

"One of the standard maxims of war," he wrote, "is to 'operate upon the enemy's communications as much as possible without exposing your own.' You seem to act as if this applies against you, but cannot apply in your favor. Change positions with the enemy, and think you not he would break your communications with Richmond within the next twenty-four hours? You dread his going into Pennsylvania, but if he does so in full force, he gives up his communications to you absolutely, and you have nothing to do but follow and ruin him. If he does so with less than full force, fall upon and beat what is left behind all the easier. You are now nearer Richmond than is the enemy by the route he and you must take. Why can you not reach there before him, unless you admit that he is more than your equal in a march? His route is the arc of a circle, while yours is the chord. The roads are as good on yours as on his. I desired you to cross the Potomac below instead of above the Shenandoah and the Blue Ridge, my idea being that this step would at once menace the enemy's communications, which I would seize if he would permit. Should he move northward, I would follow him closely, holding his communications. If he should prevent our seizing his communications and move towards Richmond, I would press closely to him, fight him if a favorable opportunity should present, and at the least try to beat him to Richmond on the inside track. If he makes a stand at Winchester, moving neither north nor south, I would fight him there, on the ground that if we cannot beat him when (as now) he bears the wastage of coming to us, we never can when we bear the wastage of going to him. As we must beat him somewhere or fail finally, we can do it, if at all, easier when he is near to us than when he is on his own ground at a distance from us. . . . In moving towards Richmond on the inside track, the facility of supplying you on the flank furthest from the enemy is remarkable. Marching by the chord line, turnpikes, railroads, and finally the Potomac by Aquia Creek, meet you at all points from Washington; the same, only the line a little lengthened, if you press closer to the Blue Ridge part of the way. The latter route, as nearest the enemy, I consider preferable; as disabling him from making an important move without your knowledge, and compelling him to keep his forces together for dread of you. The gaps (in the Blue Ridge) would enable you to attack him if you should wish. For a great part ot the way you would practically be between the enemy and both Washington and Richmond, enabling us to spare you the greatest number of troops from here. When at length your running for Richmond ahead of him enables him to move this way, if he does so, then turn round and attack him in his rear. But I think he should be engaged long before such point is reached. It seems all easy if our troops march as well as the enemy, and it is unmanly to say they cannot do this."

Here every alternative is recognized and the method of deal-

ing with it prescribed. One of the alternatives, and this the one which characteristically McClellan most apprehended, the President obviously regarded as most remote—the contingency that Lee might invade Pennsylvania. Had he thought this likely or even reasonably possible, he would not have concerned himself in so great detail with urging the advantage of the march to Richmond on "the inside track." He clearly recognized that among the virtues of that course, was making impossible a Confederate advance into Pennsylvania, unless Lee had become a lunatic. Had this not been his conviction, it may be safely assumed that he would have detained McClellan in the Cumberberland Valley until Lee either should cross the Potomac, or withdraw southward, if, as would have been but too probable, the former could not have been prevailed on to strike the Confederate chief in his position at Winchester.

Admirable as was the letter from which the above quotations have been taken, there is, however, a point in the armor of its argument which in candor must be exposed. Lincoln's reasoning was on the assumption that a Northern army could march as fast as a Southern one. Twice in his letter he postulates this equality, once indeed denouncing an assertion to the contrary as "unmanly." Unmanly or not, the operation to the contrary was a "hard fact." The individual Northerner might cover ground as far and as fast as the Southerner, but throughout the war, with a solitary exception—the rush without impediments from Petersburg to Appomattox—no Northern army ever had the heels of the unencumbered cohorts of the South. A week later than the date of the President's letter to McClellan, Halleck under his directions wrote thus to Buell, who, after the battle of Perryville had expelled Bragg from Kentucky with what he considered reasonable expedition: "The President does not understand why we cannot march as the enemy marches, live as he lives, and fight as he fights, unless we admit the inferiority of our troops and of our generals." Buell's answer was conclusive and went direct to the heart of the matter. "The spirit of the rebellion," he replied, "enforces a subordination and patient submission to privations and want, which public sentiment renders absolutely impossible among our troops. Again, instead of imitating the enemy's methods, I should rather say that his failure had been in a measure due to their peculiar character."

The late Quartermaster-General of the war time, in his farewell to the Department whose honored head he had so long been, could make the modest and truthful claim that only during two short intervals did any troops of the Union lack their full and regular rations. But this fulness and regularity could be attained only by the troops being followed close by ample trains; and it may be taken as an axiom that in a poorly-roaded country ample trains and long, swift marches, such as those of Jackson from the Rappahannock to Manassas, through Thoroughfare Gap, and up the Shenandoah Valley, fighting as he hurried, are incompatible. After Buell's blunt retort, Lincoln is no more found upholding the North's equality of marching power.

McClellan accepted in principle the President's project of an advance towards Richmond on the "inside track," delaying, however, to move until ten days later. By November 7 he had slowly drifted as far south as Rectortown. Before then Lee had struck into the "inside track," at Culpeper, thus interposing between McClellan and Richmond. The President had determined to draw the line at this contingency. When it occurred he deprived McClellan of his command, and the military career of that officer terminated.

The President gave Burnside no instructions of a strategic character, unless that complexion may belong to the permission that he might undertake the "mud march" on his own responsibility. Nothing can be finer than the tone of his letter to Hooker on his promotion as Burnside's successor. When the new chief of the Army of the Potomac had pulled his command together, and was ready for action with 130,000 men at his back, he wrote to the President a sketch of that projected movement of his which ended disastrously at Chancellorsville, characteristically expressing his apprehension lest Lee should retire from before him the moment he should cross the river, by the shortest line to Richmond, and "thus escape being seriously crippled." The President, in replying, did not in so many words discourage the scheme devised by the man whom he had esteemed good soldier enough to be put in command of a great army. That was a responsibility on which the civilian strategist would not venture; but it would have been well for Hooker if he had allowed himself to be influenced by the tenor of the memorandum which the President promptly sent him.

"My opinion is," wrote Lincoln, "that just now, with the enemy directly ahead of us, there is no eligible route for us into Richmond. Hence our prime object is the enemy's army in front of us, and is not with or about Richmond at all, unless incidentally to the main object. What then? The two armies are face to face with a narrow river between them. Our communications are shorter and safer" (by Aquia Creek) "than are those of the enemy. For this reason we can, with equal powers, fret him more than he can us. I do not think that by raids towards Washington he can derange the Army of the Potomac at all. He has no distant operations which can call any of the Army of the Potomac away; we have such operations which may call him away, at least in part" (in South Carolina, at Vicksburg, etc.). "While he remains intact I do not think we should take the disadvantage of attacking him in his intrenchments, but we should continually harass and menace him, so that he shall have no leisure or safety in sending away detachments. If he weakens himself, then pitch into him."

The President could not but discern that the attempt by a wide turning movement, in wooded and intricate ground, which had been very imperfectly, if indeed at all, reconnoitred, to take in rear the Confederate army now occupying Fredericksburg heights, was an extremely hazardous undertaking. If to dislodge it from that commanding position was at present an object of great importance, the President indicated how the attainment of that object might be set about—by fretment, by raids on its communications, by menacing its flanks, etc. Stoneman's raid, more thoroughly and energetically carried out when the weather should improve, by destroying Lee's communications, would have compelled him to evacuate the position and fall back on his depôts. But Hooker's impatience so overmastered him that, whereas Stoneman was to have been sent out a fortnight in advance of the main movement, and was retarded by swollen rivers and impassable roads, Hooker's infantry and Stoneman's cavalry crossed the Rappahannock together, and Stoneman had scarcely begun his work when already defeat had befallen Hooker. Once again the incapacity of its chief had thrown the dark shadow of defeat on the army of the Potomac, and the President had once again the dreary task of writing heartening letters to a discomfited commander. By this he must have got accustomed to that melancholy duty.

It was so far to Hooker's credit that he discerned Lee's intention to march across Virginia to the Upper Potomac in advance of the commencement of that movement which began on June 3. It was a strangely executed movement, conducted as if in sheer contempt of the Federal army; straggled athwart Virginia, its

head was actually at Winchester, within a few marches of the Potomac, while its rear still stood fast in the Fredericksburg lines. The Nicolay-Hay biography expresses great commendation of Hooker's conduct at this juncture: "He was moving his force from the line of Aquia to the Potomac with wonderful efficiency and skill;"—"his action was never more intelligent and energetic than at this time."

With all respect for the authors of that admirable work, I must venture to demur to these encomiums. What was the plain duty before Hooker, as soldier alike and citizen? The irresistible inference from his prognosis just cited was that Lee's intention was to invade Maryland or Pennsylvania. It was a reproach to the North as a military power that its territory should be isolated by hostile arms. Not only this, but invasion involved the desolation of Northern homes, the burning of Northern villages, requisitions at the bayonet's point, the misery and dismay of Northern communities. Surely it lay upon Hooker to strain every nerve to avert this reproach, and to fend off from his countrymen the horrors of invasion. It behooved him, then, immediately to envelop the left flank of Lee's army with his greatly superior force of cavalry, charged as soon as Lee's, the head of Lee's advance moved out, to send the Federal commander prompt information that the Confederate movement had begun. Pending such intelligence Hooker had ample time to bring his forces together, and have them in readiness to move at short notice. On receipt of the expected information he was promptly to move out, the head of his army somewhat ahead of his adversary, the mass following in echelon; not trailed out, yet not too closely compacted. He had the interior lines—the "inside track;" all the way to the Blue Ridge his march would cover Washington. Opportunities might offer to strike the "slim animal" to advantage in the course of the march, and by utilizing his shorter distance it would be possible for him to be in position in advance on the northern bank of the Potomac, standing there resolute to thwart the enemy's attempt to invade the Northern soil. In all this there is no strain on possibilities, but the contrary. Marching on the chord would have compensated for the slower Northern pace; from Washington by numerous roads would have radiated to him supplies and reinforcements; success would have given him the fee simple of the command of the Army of the Potomac.

And what did he actually do to merit the encomiums to which I have taken exception? When Ewell was already in the Shenandoah Valley Sickles, heading Hooker's advance, was no further than at Bealeton, two marches out from headquarters on the Falmouth plateau. Hooker, serenely remaining there, was meditating the dubious exploit of striking at Hill, still remaining on the Fredericksburg intrenchments, a project of which the President disapproved in terms as quaint as they were strategically sound. The enemy, he wrote, would be fighting behind intrenchments, "and have you at disadvantage, and so, man for man, worst you at that point, while his main force would in some way be getting an advantage of you northward. In one word, I would not take any risk of being entangled upon the river like an ox jumped half over a fence and liable to be torn by dogs front and rear without a fair chance to gore one way or kick the other." Then, Lee in full march on the Upper Potomac, Hooker made the wild proposal that he should be allowed to march on Richmond, a project which might have resulted in the fulfilment of Lee's grim jest about "swapping queens." This erratic scheme found no favor with Lincoln, whose answer was: "I would not go south of Rappahannock upon Lee's moving north of it. If you had Richmond invested to-day you would not be able to take it in twenty days. I think Lee's army, and not Richmond, is your sure objective point"—the great fact which the President had already comprehended in the early days, and never after left grip of. Finally Hooker struck camp on June 13, Hill being so polite as to see him off before he, too, moved. He hurt Lee nowhere south of the Potomac. It is quite true, if it were anything to be proud of, that in the words of the biographers, Hooker "was able at perfect leisure to choose his time and place for crossing the river." Indeed, with somewhat misplaced complaisance, he "waited" until Lee's whole army was on the north side; and, while at length he was leisurely crossing, Ewell and Hill and Longstreet were also choosing at perfect leisure their times and places for harrying unfortunate Pennsylvania almost to the Susquehanna. Yet Hooker on the Potomac was preferable to Hooker fiddling outside Richmond while Rome was burning beyond the Virginia line, and it has to be said that but for the President he might have been in the former locality.

Lincoln does not appear to have written any strategic letters to Grant, Sherman, or Sheridan. There is an interesting series of letters of that character to Burnside in East Tennessee during Rosecrans's evil days in Chattanooga, but the subject is of subordinate importance. Some of the President's letters to Rosecrans would strengthen the contention that he possessed strategic genius were there space to quote and elucidate them.

ARCHIBALD FORBES.

THE POINT OF VIEW.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

WHEN Christians fall out, Pagans come by their own. I have long been of the opinion that the Prophet Isaiah made up his most interesting list of the articles proper to a fashionable Hebrew lady's gala dress from the point of view of a reformer, and not of a historian. The latter aims to give an accurate presentation, with true perspective, of the age with which he deals; the former seeks a picturesque and salient point on which to hang his reform.

The world has been too willing to take Isaiah as a historian alone, and to assume that female Judea was given over to finery; that the Lord is angry at finery, and is, therefore, liable at any moment to strip it all away. This is because the criticism of the world, the interpretation of documents, public opinion, has been chiefly in the hands of men. Now men love finery; but they love it on women. It is too much trouble to wear it themselves, but they love to see women decorated. They pose, and they often preach against it; they do not particularly love its cost, but the finery itself they fall down and worship. Then, to make things even, they decry women for wearing it! Public declamation against it comes from masculine shame-facedness and dislike of paying the bills. Feminine persistence in it comes from man's helpless adoration of the finery.

Women are acute enough to know this, and it does not require a phenomenal acuteness. They know that Isaiah and Jeremiah and all the prophets who inveigh against the bravery of their tinkling ornaments, their round tires like the moon, their changeable suits of apparel, their rings and chains and bracelets, their mantles and their wimples and their crisping-pins—follow the tinkle like sheep—love these round tires like the moon, dia-

mond crescents sparkling in the dark hair of beauty—love the looping chains of pearls festooning films of lace that veil sweetness with fascination. How do women know it? In a thousand ways—one being that as soon as Isaiah and Jeremiah, Micah and Malachi are in love they go straightway and buy the costliest ring that can be had for their money and slip it with much idol worship on the adored finger. They know it because when Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Malachi and Micah, and Habakkuk and Haggai go into society they fall meekly—radiantly—into line behind the most featly emblazoned great lady and are proud to take her down to supper, to sip her five o'clock tea, to drive her out to the races, to have her name on their charities, and her pew in their churches. They know it because when they preach that the Lord has taken her finery by way of punishment, the most signal token of Divine pardon they hold out to her is that she shall have it all back again! "Awake! awake! put on thy strength, O Zion! *Put on thy* BEAUTIFUL *garments!*" cries Isaiah, thus frankly recognizing the propriety and the potency of those very mantles and wimples which in a spasm—a holy spasm—of reform, he had but lately torn from his lady's shoulders; recognizing that, if the heart be right, the more lovely the clothes the better; recognizing that, if the king's daughter be all glorious within, her clothing *ought* to be of wrought gold!

Women have not yet, perhaps to any appreciable extent, changed public opinion, but they have clung to their inalienable right of fine clothes with a tenacity that should be a lesson to men and may be to angels, in the prevailing power of native truth over acquired error.

That intangible thing "society" is much engaged at present in surveying itself; and the survey seems to consist chiefly in exploiting its own and its neighbor's vices, so that an onlooker might be excused for inferring that Christian civilization at the end of the nineteenth century is in a very bad way—is in the same way which led the Pagan civilizations, through luxury and immorality, to decay and death.

Perhaps in the light of Isaiah's lamp we may discover a little longer lease of life.

Among other lions, those stirred up by Lady Henry Somerset growl most gruesomely against our time—which seems to borrow something mysterious and awe-inspiring if, instead of calling it

the closing years of the Nineteenth Century, we Gallicise it into *fin de siécle.*

Lady Henry Somerset has visited the United States and has had the temerity to speak well of her hosts,—which her British hearers account for in that winsome way wherewith our kin beyond sea love to sweeten and strengthen the ties of blood.

"The title-loving Americans made much of her—in fact, simply idolized her. In the United States so dearly are the members of the nobility loved that there is little or nothing the Yankees would not do for a mere lordling, let alone for the daughter of an earl, the sister of a duchess, and the daughter-in-law of a duke."

Having thus summarily disposed of any personal charms, any historic interest, any moral and religious influence which the lady may have possessed, by laying to pure snobbery the hospitality shown her in this country, her amiable countrymen proceed to pull to pieces with neatness and despatch the pleasant reflections which this hospitality engendered. "In America, unlike England," Lady Henry was unlucky enough to remark, "the women are more intellectual than the men." "A misstatement. A deviation from the straight path of fact," sternly pronounces her censor; but whether it is because the American woman is *not* more intellectual than the American man, or because the English woman *is* more intellectual than the English man, doth not appear. Indeed, how can it ever appear? Whose hand holds the measuring line that shall decide anything so immeasureable as mental stature?

> "What the hammer, what the chain,
> That shall measure strength of brain?"

Lady Henry states her opinion and the British lion falls upon it tooth and nail and tears it to fiddlestrings, but it was only an opinion to begin with, and such it remains. Nay, our English brethren of the orthodox confession are one with Lady Henry.

In search of the mantles and the wimples and the crisping-pins of the Lady Isaiah, I turned to the concordance of the Oxford Bible. Elijah's mantle is there with the full description of the manner in which he used it; Job's mantle is there with the reckless way in which he tore it; and David's hyperbolical mantle is there, wherewith he would fain his enemies should hide their shame; but Isaiah's mantles are not in it. Those old

Oxonians tucked all the men's topcoats into their concordance, though not one of them was put to any legitimate use; while, of the women's mantles worn as they should be, for shelter and grace, not a flutter, or fold, or fringe from Genesis to Malachi!

The crisping-pins tack on the same moral. The loom-pin that was improvised into a hair-pin for Samson is drawn out at full length; but there is no room for the daring, dangerous, swift crisping-pin that shall tumble and toss my lady's curls so naturally over her fair, clear brow.

> "Shine out, little head sunning over with curls,
> To the flowers and be their sun,"

though the mantle that a man wishes be deemed worthier than the mantle a woman wears; though the hair-pin that ensnares a man seem more dignified than that which adorns a woman, even if the latter serves for both.

So far, however, we are in a calm atmosphere. Continental intelligence is not set over against insular intelligence in the bulk, however it may be distributed between the sexes, but when Lady Henry goes further and dares to say that "the familiar footing which exists between the American young man and woman before their betrothal results in far happier homes after marriage than does the strict rule of London Society," then indeed rises up a whole den of lions brushing the dew from their manes and growling as they brush: "There are *no* women so pure and good as the English women and wives." Or is this perhaps only gallant? Shall we pardon the excluding ungraciousness of the negative, and the hardly positive grammar, to the loyalty of the sentiment, though it does not appear that Lady Henry anywhere attacked the purity and goodness of her countrywomen. The sudden sensitiveness of her critic is the sole foundation for suspicion. But growl rises into mania: "The horrible impurity of the most fashionable young girls in the largest cities of the Union is well known and the Deacon marriage minus the pistol shots is the typical American *ménage.*" This can only be recognized as an acute type of emotional insanity!

Yet with such admirable and accurate freehand drawing of society in "The States," our British artist still leaves a slight blur in the picture. We are warned that Lady Henry, in her flattery of our women, has been "deceiving these trustful and guileless Yankees—these simple-minded transatlantic cousins who

enthusiastically accepted as gospel every word that fell from such noble lips"—but immediately the censor turns his savage snarl upon Lady Henry, and lo! it is she who is "swallowing this time-honored, very stale, and absolutely absurd excuse which the Yankees always made for the freedom of their younger society." What, then? Why, then, the English ducal female intelligence is on a par with the simple-minded Yankee male intelligence, alike guileless, gullible, and gulled; while the American female intelligence and the English male intelligence remain alone in the dry upper air of clear truth, according to the statute for such case made and provided by Lady Henry Somerset, but ruthlessly spurned by her countryman and critic as a "deviation from fact." If this superior Englishwoman and these simple-minded Yankees had not been engaged in swallowing each other, she would have learned that "the promiscuous intermingling (wholly unrestrained by parental supervision) of young men and young women is one of the irremediable curses of United States society—irremediable because the boys and girls say to their parents, when any attempt to restrain them is made, 'This is a free country; you did as you pleased when you were our age, and we shall do as we please now;' and a curse because it results in the most gross immorality, and in making married homes in the States just the reverse of what Lady Henry was led into thinking they were."

The venerable *Blackwood* behaveth himself still more unseemly. American boys and girls skim over his decorous pages "like half broken colts and fillies. The girls are often so perverse as in 'pure cussedness' to delight in skating upon all sorts of social ice." Becoming "inmates of disorderly houses," they show the baleful effects of the unrestrained intercourse of the sexes. "Owing to the unconventionality of society, a great number of black sheep of both sexes are found in the best society cliques." Marriage bonds set loosely, or not at all. Generally speaking, the laws and institutions of the several States and of the Union favor law-breakers. Two-thirds of the population of the United States never enter a church. It is safe to hold that most of the professed Christians are in fact idolators. It is alien-born citizens who fight with their fists chiefly, but it is the native born who are adepts in the use of revolvers and razors. Thus bewaileth our British Jeremiah. But, though cast down, that we may not be destroyed, this intelligent observer, after

having arrayed his American cousins in an attractive travelling costume of frayed virtue, chronic dyspepsia, bad teeth and nervous restlessness, protests: "We indeed admire and love the American ladies, but until they have been caught, tamed and civilized by European influences, they are not to be named with the Continental ladies, and are as inferior to English women as the light of a wax taper to the sun." One of them is caught, and is at this moment being tamed and civilized in Woking Prison, though there is danger that the poor little wax taper will go out under its vigorous snuffing.

The general situation, however, is no sooner extreme than it is relieved. Spots are admitted on the sun!

"The truth is that London Society—impure though it may be—is, after all said and done, less so than that of New York."

This is a frightful descent. Why have we been lashed up High Holborn with whips and scorpions only to be rolled rapidly down into Rotten Row? Is it not as difficult to measure moral impurity as mental cleverness? And if American religion be idolatrous, American institutions lawless, American marriage adulterous, American Society ruled by the revolver and the razor, is it worth while to edit monthly magazines and weekly newspapers on the frail crust that London Society is only "less so"?

Is it even less? We have a picture of London Society drawn by itself very cleverly in a late number of this REVIEW. And we have a picture of New York Society drawn by itself, not cleverly, but evidently with an awful sincerity, in a book lately published. An unhappy impression produced by this book was, I admit, that the chief ambition for distinction in New York Society was in the fashion of eating and drinking. But the English delineator says definitely and with a homely and ashamed frankness: "The inclination of the English as regards society is to eat and not to talk!"

Between these two competent critics what is left to choose? The English pot weeps over the American kettle that American boys and girls "have a contempt for all and every kind of restraint, the unmarried girl disregarding her father's authority as much as the wife that of the husband." But the delicate English tea-urn drops a tear into the English pot: "The respect for parents, the self-denial and self-abnegation of the past have disappeared, and parents and children now meet nearly on an equal-

ity, but where there is any inferiority it is on the parental side."

So then Daisy Miller has taken lodgings in St. James's Park?

Do black sheep stray into our commons? If contemporary English authority is to be trusted, black sheep lead, if they do not constitute, the "smartest" flocks, on the troubled Thames. "All that is needed to insure an entrance into the highest society in England is unlimited wealth. Morality is unnecessary. An important addition is made to the moral law, 'thou shalt not be found out.'" Vice is not confined to the "inmates of disorderly houses," but disorderly houses at the head and in the heart of society flaunt a handsome gown as the price of womanhood, a French table for a man's infamy.

Let it be noticed that Americans have not contributed to these pictures. Lady Henry Somerset portrayed her pleasant American visit in rosy hues. Her censor came by, seized the brush and dabbed the portrait with lamp-black. *Blackwood* rose up in frenzy and mopped out with his crossing-broom every feature of civilization. All these tints are laid upon the London canvas by English artists. In this Royal Academy of Design America has not competed.

The American vice which disheartens our British contemporaries is three thousand miles away. Is it not possible that the portentous hues of the vision may be due to a distorting medium? If the observer were suffocating up to the eyes in this hideousness it would be cause for immediate alarm; but as the air seems clear around Piccadilly and only murky across the ocean, is it not just possible that the murk is due to atmospheric refraction or planetary spheroidity?

The real crime of Israel was beating the people to pieces and grinding the faces of the poor; in his wrath at such wrong it seemed to the prophet that the very girls of Jerusalem, innocent no doubt as many of them were, gay-hearted and perhaps thoughtless, only added to his woe by their heedless mirth, walking and mincing as they went. It was the natural out-pour of an honest patriotic heart wrung with the suffering of the people and stung even by the pleasant light laughter and tinkling ornaments, where he would fain have seen every one bent only on reform; just as I would, if I could, stop every festivity and turn every silk into sack-cloth till that innocent young mother is loosed from Woking

Prison. But I do not believe Isaiah would have taken those gentle Jewish ladies one by one and pronounced upon them the curse of hardness or lewdness, any more than we should say that every Princess of the house of Hanover is a female Torquemada because the slaughter of the innocent goes on.

There was a caprice a few months ago which led young women to descend upon one like a hawk with only the innocent purpose of shaking hands. It was not precisely mincing as they go but swooping as they come, and if Isaiah were writing about us he would probably substitute the pounce for the mince, but it is simply a harmless tint of the picture, not a moral quality. If women are just and pure and kind, Isaiah will not quarrel with them because they tiptoe in a "Grecian bend" or greet him with a parabolic arm, or drop a little snap-shot of the knee-joint. The fashion of this world passeth away. The old prophets knew it as well as we, and used the fashions only for local color.

In the corruption and destruction of our politics our Jeremiah of *Blackwood* rests all lamentations on a hypothesis. "In the United States when a new President comes into office, there may be a complete change from top to bottom." "*May be*"—even Jeremiah does not claim that there is—only "may be."

Well, the Lord of the Universe has so little regard for tenure of office that he has constructed this world on a most insecure basis. There is not one hour of the twenty-four during which every human being "may" not throw himself down stairs and break his neck, and thus bring humanity to a perpetual end. Yes, even the lips which speak to us so eloquently from *Blackwood* "might" close in hari-kari, or, which would be almost as disastrous to us, when *Blackwood* bids his contributor warn us across the sea of wrath to come, that gentleman "*might*" thrust out his tongue and hold it close between finger and thumb, steadily refusing to speak to us the word of life.

He does not do it. Heaven is kind. Things are not so bad actually as they are logically. Still are spared to us the mellifluous accents of our loving British kinsfolk and their far-shining beacon light, and while that lamp holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return and thus prove to England that our own amosphere is not fatally de-oxygenated!

There "*may be*" the deluge, but still, with each approach of our Union's quadrennial election, our poor, lawless, religionless, un-

married, and unguarded country lurches ahead ; the Behring Sea thumps against the white cliffs of England and the Amazon pours into the Mississippi. Our silver coins rattle louder and louder against the gates of India, our protected products sweep a wider and wider swath across the world, although the remark of our "esteemed contemporary" is strictly true and we "may" rise any morning to find that every clerk in the country has been turned adrift and every other officer has resigned his post and all the morning journals are out in big head-lines advertising for a Government that mysteriously disappeared over night !

If Mrs. Montague should happen to be looking into a certain American morning room at this moment she would see a beautiful strong creature with yellow-brown eyes and a great shock of yellow curls, talking all the time, running away in turn with the parasol and the watch and each dainty belonging of his new-come guest, his tall and stately Maud of the milk-white fawn, Maud of the pearl-pink cheek, and calling her by her first name with infantine silver-sweet, fascinating familiarity. I am quite sure that Mrs. Montague would not like it. He is indeed too "wholly unrestrained by parental supervision" to meet Mrs. Montague's peculiar views of "supervision" or Mr. Montague's peculiar views of a father's obligation. They do not see that the young mother watches her young beauty every moment, and that the danger is not that he will be too unrestrained, but that he will be too carefully guarded. Mrs. Montague's fingers no doubt clutch restlessly at an imaginary switch, the real one being for the moment beyond her reach—and so happily beyond her reach forever is the innocent baby who dragged out three hapless years under her strictly parental supervision.

In the "horrible impurity" of New York society a home is desolate. It is a home which I have never entered, of which I should never have known but for the celebrity of its wealth and magnificence, and of which I have never known anything but good. From its hearth-stone the eldest son has passed away, and no splendor of the fashion of this world can prevent the thrill of sympathetic grief that strikes into all hearts for this passion of loss. Even in the coarse woodcuts of the newspapers, his appears a gentle, fine, winsome face. All boyish companions have a simple good word for their lost mate. There was wealth to minister to every wish, but no note of a coarse or vicious trait. The

American weakness of parental indulgence was not wanting. When on a tour in Greece the father's courage gave way before some special difficulty of travel or climate, the boy cried out in comic consternation, "Why, I thought we were going to travel in Greece! I thought we were going to see the tomb of Agamemnon!" And they did. Such a father could but obey such a boy.

With that promising brief life too quickly ended, I think the father is not sorry to be associated with its manly pleasures, with tender lavishments, rather than with repressions and restraints—since restraints enough there were to make its memory a perpetual blessing, its hope the radiance of the future.

Alas! Alas! Even while I am sending away the last proofs of these last paragraphs, there has fallen upon the sunny morning-room a darkness that may be felt. The beautiful, strong father of the beautiful strong child lies with folded hands, deaf to all the dear voices. "Wholly unrestrained by parental supervision"—yes; because his native rectitude seemed restraint enough and the whole loving community guarded his fearless, adventurous infancy. Fond eyes still see through their tears his baby feet pattering over the bridge in the marching ranks of the soldiers, into whose camp he had strayed and strolled, and who were escorting him home from his happy gala day well kept in line by their laughing bayonets. Wholly unrestrained, but most tenderly nurtured by parental supervision, how goodly he grew, how wise, protecting, calm, courageous, sustained and sustaining! If his character held a flaw I do not know it. For wife and child, for brother and sister, for father and mother, all ye that are about him, bemoan him; and all ye that knew his name, say, How is the strong staff broken, and the beautiful rod!

> "So princely, tender, truthful, reverent, pure—
> Mourn! That a world-wide empire mourns with you
> Were slender solace. Yet be comforted;
> For if this earth be ruled by Perfect Love
> The face of Death is towards the Sun of Life.
> His shadow darkens earth; his truer name
> Is 'Onward.' No discordance in the roll
> And march of that Eternal Harmony
> Whereto the worlds beat time, tho' faintly heard,—
> Until the great Hereafter, mourn in hope."

GAIL HAMILTON.

THOMAS PAINE.

BY COL. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

"A great man's memory may outlive his life half a year,
But, by'r lady, he must build churches then."

EIGHTY-THREE years ago Thomas Paine ceased to defend himself. The moment he became dumb all his enemies found a tongue. He was attacked on every hand. The Tories of England had been waiting for their revenge. The believers in kings, in hereditary government, the nobility of every land, execrated his memory. Their greatest enemy was dead. The believers in human slavery, and all who clamored for the rights of the States as against the sovereignty of a Nation, joined in the chorus of denunciation. In addition to this, the believers in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the occupants of orthodox pulpits, the professors in Christian colleges, and the religious historians, were his sworn and implacable foes.

This man had gratified no ambition at the expense of his fellow men; he had desolated no country with the flame and sword of war; he had not wrung millions from the poor and unfortunate; he had betrayed no trust, and yet he was almost universally despised. He gave his life for the benefit of mankind. Day and night for many, many weary years, he labored for the good of others, and gave himself body and soul to the great cause of human liberty. And yet he won the hatred of the people for whose benefit, for whose emancipation, for whose civilization, for whose exaltation he gave his life.

Against him every slander that malignity could coin and hypocrisy pass was gladly and joyously taken as genuine, and every truth with regard to his career was believed to be counterfeit. He was attacked by thousands where he was defended by one, and the one who defended him was instantly attacked, silenced, or destroyed.

At last his life has been written by Moncure D. Conway, and

the real history of Thomas Paine, of what he attempted and accomplished, of what he taught and suffered, has been intelligently, truthfully and candidly given to the world. Henceforth the slanderer will be without excuse.

He who reads Mr. Conway's pages will find that Thomas Paine was more than a patriot—that he was a philanthropist—a lover not only of his country, but of all mankind. He will find that his sympathies were with those who suffered, without regard to religion or race, country or complexion. He will find that this great man did not hesitate to attack the governing class of his native land—to commit what was called treason against the king, that he might do battle for the rights of men ; that in spite of the prejudices of birth, he took the side of the American Colonies ; that he gladly attacked the political abuses and absurdities that had been fostered by altars and thrones for many centuries ; that he was for the people against nobles and kings, and that he put his life in pawn for the good of others.

In the winter of 1774 Thomas Paine came to America. After a time he was employed as one of the writers on "The Pennsylvania Magazine."

Let us see what he did, calculated to excite the hatred of his fellow men.

The first article he ever wrote in America, and the first ever published by him anywhere, appeared in that magazine on the 8th of March, 1775. It was an attack on American slavery—a plea for the rights of the negro. In that article will be found substantially all the arguments that can be urged against that most infamous of all institutions. Every line is full of humanity, pity, tenderness, and love of justice. Five days after this article appeared the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed. Certainly this should not excite our hatred. To-day the civilized world agrees with the essay written by Thomas Paine in 1775.

At that time great interests were against him. The owners of slaves became his enemies, and the pulpits, supported by slave labor, denounced this abolitionist.

The next article published by Thomas Paine, in the same magazine, and for the next month, was an attack on the practice of duelling, showing that it was barbarous, that it did not even tend to settle the right or wrong of a dispute, that it could not be defended on any just grounds, and that its influence was degrad-

ing and cruel. The civilized world now agrees with the opinions of Thomas Paine upon that barbarous practice.

In May, 1775, appeared in the same magazine another article written by Thomas Paine, a Protest Against Cruelty to Animals. He began the work that was so successfully and gloriously carried out by Henry Bergh, one of the noblest, one of the grandest, men that this continent has produced.

The good people of this world agree with Thomas Paine.

In August of the same year he wrote a plea for the Rights of Woman, the first ever published in the New World. Certainly he should not be hated for that.

He was the first to suggest a union of the Colonies. Before the Declaration of Independence was issued, Paine had written of and about the Free and Independent States of America. He had also spoken of the United Colonies as the "Glorious Union," and he was the first to write these words: "The United States of America."

In May, 1775, Washington said: "If you ever hear of me joining in any such measure (as separation from Great Britain) you have my leave to set me down for everything wicked." He had also said: "It is not the wish or interest of the government (meaning Massachusetts), or of any other upon this continent, separately or collectively, to set up for independence." And in the same year Benjamin Franklin assured Chatham that no one in America was in favor of separation. As a matter of fact, the people of the Colonies wanted a redress of their grievances—they were not dreaming of separation, of independence.

In 1775 Paine wrote the pamphlet known as "Common Sense." This was published on the 10th of January, 1776. It was the first appeal for independence, the first cry for national life, for absolute separation. No pamphlet, no book, ever kindled such a sudden conflagration,—a purifying flame, in which the prejudices and fears of millions were consumed. To read it now, after the lapse of more than a hundred years, hastens the blood. It is but the meagre truth to say that Thomas Paine did more for the cause of separation, to sow the seeds of independence, than any other man of his time. Certainly we should not despise him for this. The Declaration of Independence followed, and in that declaration will be found not only the thoughts, but some of the expressions, of Thomas Paine.

During the war, and in the very darkest hours, Paine wrote what is called "The Crisis," a series of pamphlets giving from time to time his opinion of events, and his prophecies. These marvellous publications produced an effect nearly as great as the pamphlet "Common Sense." These strophes, written by the bivouac fires, had in them the soul of battle.

In all he wrote, Paine was direct and natural. He touched the very heart of the subject. He was not awed by names or titles, by place or power. He never lost his regard for truth, for principle—never wavered in his allegiance to reason, to what he believed to be right. His arguments were so lucid, so unanswerable, his comparisons and analogies so apt, so unexpected, that they excited the passionate admiration of friends and the unquenchable hatred of enemies. So great were these appeals to patriotism, to the love of liberty, the pride of independence, the glory of success, that it was said by some of the best and greatest of that time that the American cause owed as much to the pen of Paine as to the sword of Washington.

On the 2d day of November, 1779, there was introduced into the Assembly of Pennsylvania an act for the abolition of slavery. The preamble was written by Thomas Paine. To him belongs the honor and glory of having written the first Proclamation of Emancipation in America—Paine the first, Lincoln the last.

Paine, of all others, succeeded in getting aid for the struggling colonies from France. "According to Lamartine, the king, Louis XVI., loaded Paine with favors, and a gift of six millions was confided into the hands of Franklin and Paine. On the 25th of August, 1781, Paine reached Boston bringing 2,500,000 livres in silver, and in convoy a ship laden with clothing and military stores."

"In November, 1779, Paine was elected Clerk to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. In 1780, the Assembly received a letter from General Washington in the field, saying that he feared the distresses in the army would lead to mutiny in the ranks. This letter was read by Paine to the Assembly. He immediately wrote to Blair McClenaghan, a Philadelphia merchant, explaining the urgency, and inclosing $500, the amount of salary due him as Clerk, as his contribution towards a relief fund. The merchant called a meeting the next day, and read Paine's letter. A subscription list was immediately circulated, and in a short

time about $1,500,000 was raised. With this capital the Pennsylvania Bank—afterwards the Bank of North America—was established for the relief of the army."

In 1783 "Paine wrote a memorial to Chancellor Livingston, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Robert Morris, Minister of Finance, and his assistant, urging the necessity of adding a Continental Legislature to Congress, to be elected by the several States. Robert Morris invited the Chancellor and a number of eminent men to meet Paine at dinner, where his plea for a stronger Union was discussed and approved. This was probably the earliest of a series of consultations preliminary to the Constitutional Convention."

"On the 19th of April, 1783, it being the eighth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, Paine printed a little pamphlet entitled 'Thoughts on Peace and the Probable Advantages Thereof.'" In this pamphlet he pleads for "a supreme Nationality absorbing all cherished sovereignties." Mr. Conway calls this pamphlet Paine's "Farewell Address," and gives the following extract:

"It was the cause of America that made me an author. The force with which it struck my mind, and the dangerous condition in which the country was in, by courting an impossible and an unnatural reconciliation with those who were determined to reduce her, instead of striking out into the only line that could save her,—a Declaration of Independence,—made it impossible for me, feeling as I did, to be silent; and if, in the course of more than seven years, I have rendered her any service, I have likewise added something to the reputation of literature, by freely and disinterestedly employing it in the great cause of mankind. . . . But as the scenes of war are closed, and every man preparing for home and happier times, I therefore take leave of the subject. I have most sincerely followed it from beginning to end, and through all its turns and windings; and whatever country I may hereafter be in, I shall always feel an honest pride at the part I have taken and acted, and a gratitude to nature and providence for putting it in my power to be of some use to mankind."

Paine had made some enemies, first, by attacking African slavery, and, second, by insisting upon the sovereignty of the Nation.

During the Revolution our forefathers, in order to justify making war on Great Britain, were compelled to take the ground that all men are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In no other way could they justify their action. After the war, the meaner instincts began to take possession of the mind, and those who had fought for their own liberty were perfectly willing to enslave others. We must also remember that the Revolution was begun and carried on by a noble minority—that

the majority were really in favor of Great Britain and did what they dared to prevent the success of the American cause. The minority, however, had control of affairs. They were active, energetic, enthusiastic, and courageous, and the majority were overawed, shamed, and suppressed. But when peace came, the majority asserted themselves and the interests of trade and commerce were consulted. Enthusiasm slowly died, and patriotism was mingled with the selfishness of traffic.

But, after all, the enemies of Paine were few, the friends were many. He had the respect and admiration of the greatest and the best, and was enjoying the fruits of his labor.

The Revolution was ended, the colonies were free. They had been united, they formed a Nation, and the United States of America had a place on the map of the world.

Paine was not a politician. He had not labored for seven years to get an office. His services were no longer needed in America. He concluded to educate the English people, to inform them of their rights, to expose the pretences, follies and fallacies, the crimes and cruelties of nobles, kings, and parliaments. In the brain and heart of this man were the dream and hope of the universal republic. He had confidence in the people. He hated tyranny and war, despised the senseless pomp and vain show of crowned robbers, laughed at titles, and the "honorable" badges worn by the obsequious and servile, by fawners and followers; loved liberty with all his heart, and bravely fought against those who could give the rewards of place and gold, and for those who could pay only with thanks.

Hoping to hasten the day of freedom, he wrote the "Rights of Man"—a book that laid the foundation for all the real liberty that the English now enjoy—a book that made known to Englishmen the Declaration of Nature, and convinced millions that all are children of the same mother, entitled to share equally in her gifts. Every Englishman who has outgrown the ideas of 1688 should remember Paine with love and reverence. Every Englishman who has sought to destroy abuses, to lessen or limit the prerogatives of the crown, to extend the suffrage, to do away with "rotten boroughs," to take taxes from knowledge, to increase and protect the freedom of speech and the press, to do away with bribes under the name of pensions, and to make England a government of principles rather than of persons, has been

compelled to adopt the creed and use the arguments of Thomas Paine. In England every step towards freedom has been a triumph of Paine over Burke and Pitt. No man ever rendered a greater service to his native land.

The book called the "Rights of Man" was the greatest contribution that literature had given to liberty. It rests on the bed rock. No attention is paid to precedents except to show that they are wrong. Paine was not misled by the proverbs that wolves had written for sheep. He had the intelligence to examine for himself, and the courage to publish his conclusions. As soon as the "Rights of Man" was published the government was alarmed. Every effort was made to suppress it. The author was indicted; those who published, and those who sold, were arrested and imprisoned. But the new gospel had been preached —a great man had shed light—a new force had been born, and it was beyond the power of nobles and kings to undo what the author-hero had done.

To avoid arrest and probable death, Paine left England. He had sown with brave hand the seeds of thought, and he knew that he had lighted a fire that nothing could extinguish until England should be free.

The fame of Thomas Paine had reached France in many ways —principally through Lafayette. His services in America were well known. The pamphlet "Common Sense" had been published in French, and its effect had been immense. "The Rights of Man" that had created, and was then creating, such a stir in England, was also known to the French. The lovers of liberty everywhere were the friends and admirers of Thomas Paine. In America, England, Scotland, Ireland, and France he was known as the defender of popular rights. He had preached a new gospel. He had given a new Magna Charta to the people.

So popular was Paine in France that he was elected by three constituencies to the National Convention. He chose to represent Calais. From the moment he entered French territory he was received with almost royal honors. He at once stood with the foremost, and was welcomed by all enlightened patriots. As in America, so in France, he knew no idleness—he was an organizer and worker. The first thing he did was to found the first Republican Society, and the next to write its Manifesto, in which the ground was taken that France did not need a king; that the

people should govern themselves. In this Manifesto was this argument:

"What kind of office must that be in a government which requires neither experience nor ability to execute? that may be abandoned to the desperate chance of birth; that may be filled with an idiot, a madman, a tyrant, with equal effect as with the good, the virtuous, the wise? An office of this nature is a mere nonentity; it is a place of show, not of use."

He said:

"I am not the personal enemy of kings. Quite the contrary. No man wishes more heartily than myself to see them all in the happy and honorable state of private individuals; but I am the avowed, open and intrepid enemy of what is called monarchy; and I am such by principles which nothing can either alter or corrupt, by my attachment to humanity, by the anxiety which I feel within myself for the dignity and honor of the human race."

One of the grandest things done by Thomas Paine was his effort to save the life of Louis XVI. The Convention was in favor of death. Paine was a foreigner. His career had caused some jealousies. He knew the danger he was in—that the tiger was already crouching for a spring—but he was true to his principles. He was opposed to the death penalty. He remembered that Louis XVI. had been the friend of America, and he very cheerfully risked his life, not only for the good of France, not only to save the king, but to pay a debt of gratitude. He asked the Convention to exile the king to the United States. He asked this as a member of the Convention and as a citizen of the United States. As an American he felt grateful not only to the king, but to every Frenchman. He, the adversary of all kings, asked the Convention to remember that kings were men, and subject to human frailties. He took still another step, and said: "As France has been the first of European nations to abolish royalty, let us also be the first to abolish the punishment of death."

Even after the death of Louis had been voted, Paine made another appeal. With a courage born of the highest possible sense of duty he said:

"France has but one ally—the United States of America. That is the only Nation that can furnish France with naval provisions, for the kingdoms of Northern Europe are, or soon will be, at war with her. It happens that the person now under discussion is regarded in America as a deliverer of their country. I can assure you that his execution will there spread universal sorrow, and it is in your power not thus to wound the feelings of your ally. Could I speak the French language I would descend to your bar, and in their name become your petitioner to respite the execution of your sentence on Louis." "Ah, citizens, give not the tyrant of England the triumph of seeing

the man perish on the scaffold who helped my dear brothers of America to break his chains."

This was worthy of the man who had said : "Where Liberty is *not*, there is my country."

Paine was second on the committee to prepare the draft of a Constitution for France to be submitted to the Convention. He was the real author, not only of the draft of the Constitution, but of the Declaration of Rights.

In France, as in America, he took the lead. His first thoughts seemed to be first principles. He was clear because he was profound. People without ideas experience great difficulty in finding words to express them.

From the moment that Paine cast his vote in favor of mercy —in favor of life—the shadow of the guillotine was upon him. He knew that when he voted for the king's life, he voted for his own death. Paine remembered that the king had been the friend of America, and to him ingratitude seemed the worst of crimes. He worked to destroy the monarch, not the man ; the king, not the friend. He discharged his duty and accepted death. This was the heroism of goodness—the sublimity of devotion.

Believing that his life was near its close, he made up his mind to give to the world his thoughts concerning "revealed religion." This he had for some time intended to do, but other matters had claimed his attention. Feeling that there was no time to be lost, he wrote the first part of the "Age of Reason," and gave the manuscript to Joel Barlow. Six hours after, he was arrested. The second part was written in prison while he was waiting for death.

Paine clearly saw that men could not be really free, or defend the freedom they had, unless they were free to think and speak. He knew that the Church was the enemy of liberty, that the altar and throne were in partnership, that they helped each other and divided the spoils.

He felt that, being a man, he had the right to examine the creeds and the Scriptures for himself, and that, being an honest man, it was his duty and his privilege to tell his fellow men the conclusions at which he arrived.

He found that the creeds of all orthodox churches were absurd and cruel, and that the Bible was no better. Of course he found that there were some good things in the creeds and in the

Bible. These he defended, but the infamous, the inhuman, he attacked.

In matters of religion he pursued the same course that he had in things political. He depended upon experience, and above all on reason. He refused to extinguish the light in his own soul. He was true to himself, and gave to others his honest thoughts. He did not seek wealth, or place, or fame. He sought the truth.

He had felt it to be his duty to attack the institution of slavery in America, to raise his voice against duelling, to plead for the rights of woman, to excite pity for the sufferings of domestic animals, the speechless friends of man; to plead the cause of separation, of independence, of American nationality, to attack the abuses and crimes of monarchs, to do what he could to give freedom to the world.

He thought it his duty to take another step. Kings asserted that they derived their power, their right to govern, from God. To this assertion Paine replied with the "Rights of Man." Priests pretended that they were the authorized agents of God. Paine replied with the "Age of Reason."

This book is still a power, and will be as long as the absurdities and cruelties of the creeds and the Bible have defenders. The "Age of Reason" affected the priests just as the "Rights of Man" affected nobles and kings. The kings answered the arguments of Paine with laws, the priests with lies. Kings appealed to force, priests to fraud. Mr. Conway has written in regard to the "Age of Reason" the most impressive and the most interesting chapter in his book. Paine contended for the rights of the individual, for the jurisdiction of the soul. Above all religions he placed Reason, above all kings, Men, and above all men, Law.

The first part of the "Age of Reason" was written in the shadow of a prison, the second part in the gloom of death. From that shadow, from that gloom, came a flood of light. This testament, by which the wealth of a marvellous brain, the love of a great and heroic heart were given to the world, was written in the presence of the scaffold, when the writer believed he was giving his last message to his fellow men.

The "Age of Reason" was his crime.

Franklin, Jefferson, Sumner and Lincoln, the four greatest statesmen that America has produced, were believers in the creed of Thomas Paine.

The Universalists and Unitarians have found their best weapons, their best arguments, in the "Age of Reason."

Slowly, but surely, the churches are adopting not only the arguments, but the opinions, of the great Reformer. Theodore Parker attacked the Old Testament and Calvinistic theology with the same weapons and with a bitterness excelled by no man who has expressed his thoughts in our language.

Paine was a century in advance of his time. If he were living now his sympathy would be with Savage, Chadwick, Professor Briggs and the "advanced theologians." He, too, would talk about the "higher criticism" and the latest definition of "inspiration." These advanced thinkers substantially are repeating the "Age of Reason." They still wear the old uniform—clinging to the toggery of theology—but inside of their religious rags they agree with Thomas Paine.

Not one argument that Paine urged against the inspiration of the Bible, against the truth of miracles, against the barbarities and infamies of the Old Testament, against the pretensions of priests and the claims of kings, has ever been answered.

His arguments in favor of the existence of what he was pleased to call the God of Nature were as weak as those of all theists have been. But in all the affairs of this world, his clearness of vision, lucidity of expression, cogency of argument, aptness of comparison, power of statement and comprehension of the subject in hand, with all its bearings and consequences, have rarely, if ever, been excelled.

He had no reverence for mistakes because they were old. He did not admire the castles of Feudalism even when they were covered with ivy. He not only said that the Bible was not inspired, but he demonstrated that it could not all be true. This was "brutal." He presented arguments so strong, so clear, so convincing, that they could not be answered. This was "vulgar."

He stood for liberty against kings, for humanity against creeds and gods. This was "cowardly and low." He gave his life to free and civilize his fellow men. This was "infamous."

Paine was arrested and imprisoned in December, 1793. He was, to say the least, neglected by Gouverneur Morris and Washington. He was released through the efforts of James Monroe, in November, 1794. He was called back to the Convention, but too late to be of use. As most of the actors had suffered death,

the tragedy was about over and the curtain was falling. Paine remained in Paris until the "reign of terror" was ended and that of the Corsican tyrant had commenced.

Paine came back to America hoping to spend the remainder of his life surrounded by those for whose happiness and freedom he had labored so many years. He expected to be rewarded with the love and reverence of the American people.

In 1794 James Monroe had written to Paine these words:

"It is unnecessary for me to tell you how much all your countrymen, I speak of the great mass of the people, are interested in your welfare. They have not forgot the history of their own Revolution and the difficult scenes through which they passed; nor do they review its several stages without reviving in their bosoms a due sensibility of the merits of those who served them in that great and arduous conflict. The crime of ingratitude has not yet stained, and I hope never will stain, our national character. You are considered by them as not only having rendered important services in our own Revolution, but as being on a more extensive scale the friend of human rights and a distinguished and able advocate of public liberty. To the welfare of Thomas Paine we are not and cannot be indifferent."

In the same year Mr. Monroe wrote a letter to the Committee of General Safety, asking for the release of Mr. Paine, in which, among other things, he said:

"The services Thomas Paine rendered to his country in its struggle for freedom have implanted in the hearts of his countrymen a sense of gratitude never to be effaced *as long as they shall deserve the title of a just and generous people.*"

On reaching America, Paine found that the sense of gratitude had been effaced. He found that the Federalists hated him with all their hearts because he believed in the rights of the people and was still true to the splendid principles advocated during the darkest days of the Revolution. In almost every pulpit he found a malignant and implacable foe, and the pews were filled with his enemies. The slaveholders hated him. He was held responsible even for the crimes of the French Revolution. He was regarded as a blasphemer, an atheist, an enemy of God and man. The ignorant citizens of Bordentown, as cowardly as orthodox, longed to mob the author of "Common Sense" and "The Crisis." They thought he had sold himself to the devil because he had defended God against the slanderous charges that he had inspired the writers of the Bible—because he had said that a being of infinite goodness and purity did not establish slavery and polygamy.

Paine had insisted that men had the right to think for them-

selves. This so enraged the average American citizen that he longed for revenge.

In 1802 the people of the United States had exceedingly crude ideas about the liberty of thought and expression. Neither had they any conception of religious freedom. Their highest thought on that subject was expressed by the word "toleration," and even this toleration extended only to the various Christian sects. Even the vaunted religious liberty of colonial Maryland was only to the effect that one kind of Christian should not fine, imprison and kill another kind of Christian, but all kinds of Christians had the right, and it was their duty, to brand, imprison and kill infidels of every kind.

Paine had been guilty of thinking for himself and giving his conclusions to the world without having asked the consent of a priest—just as he had published his political opinions without leave of the king. He had published his thoughts on religion and had appealed to reason—to the light in every mind, to the humanity, the pity, the goodness which he believed to be in every heart. He denied the right of kings to make laws and of priests to make creeds. He insisted that the people should make laws, and that every human being should think for himself. While some believed in the freedom of religion, he believed in the religion of freedom.

If Paine had been a hypocrite, if he had concealed his opinions, if he had defended slavery with quotations from the "sacred scriptures"—if he had cared nothing for the liberties of men in other lands—if he had said that the state could not live without the church—if he had sought for place instead of truth, he would have won wealth and power, and his brow would have been crowned with the laurel of fame.

He made what the pious call the "mistake" of being true to himself—of living with an unstained soul. He had lived and labored for the people. The people were untrue to him. They returned evil for good, hatred for benefits received, and yet this great chivalric soul remembered their ignorance and loved them with all his heart, and fought their oppressors with all his strength.

We must remember what the churches and creeds were in that day, what the theologians really taught, and what the people believed. To save a few in spite of their vices, and to damn the many without regard to their virtues, and all for the glory of the Damner :—*this was Calvinism.* "He that hath ears to hear, let

him hear," but he that hath a brain to think must not think. He that believeth without evidence is good, and he that believeth in spite of evidence is a saint. Only the wicked doubt, only the blasphemer denies. *This was orthodox Christianity.*

Thomas Paine had the courage, the sense, the heart, to denounce these horrors, these absurdities, these infinite infamies. He did what he could to drive these theological vipers, these Calvinistic cobras, these fanged and hissing serpents of superstition from the heart of man.

A few civilized men agreed with him then, and the world has progressed since 1809. Intellectual wealth has accumulated; vast mental estates have been left to the world. Geologists have forced secrets from the rocks, astronomers from the stars, historians from old records and lost languages. In every direction the thinker and the investigator have ventured and explored, and even the pews have begun to ask questions of the pulpits. Humboldt has lived, and Darwin and Haeckel and Huxley, and the armies led by them, have changed the thought of the world.

The churches of 1809 could not be the friends of Thomas Paine. No church asserting that belief is necessary to salvation ever was, or ever will be, the champion of true liberty. A church founded on slavery—that is to say, on blind obedience, worshipping irresponsible and arbitrary power, must of necessity be the enemy of human freedom.

The orthodox churches are now anxious to save the little that Paine left of their creed. If one now believes in God, and lends a little financial aid, he is considered a good and desirable member. He need not define God after the manner of the catechism. He may talk about a "Power that works for righteousness"; or the tortoise Truth that beats the rabbit Lie in the long run; or the "Unknowable"; or the "Unconditioned"; or the "Cosmic Force"; or the "Ultimate Atom"; or "Protoplasm," or the "What"—provided he begins this word with a capital.

We must also remember that there is a difference between independence and liberty. Millions have fought for independence —to throw off some foreign yoke—and yet were at heart the enemies of true liberty. A man in jail, sighing to be free, may be said to be in favor of liberty, but not from principle; but a man who, being free, risks or gives his life to free the enslaved, is a true soldier of liberty.

Thomas Paine had passed the legendary limit of life. One by one most of his old friends and acquaintances had deserted him. Maligned on every side, execrated, shunned and abhorred—his virtues denounced as vices—his services forgotten—his character blackened, he preserved the poise and balance of his soul. He was a victim of the people, but his convictions remained unshaken. He was still a soldier in the army of freedom, and still tried to enlighten and civilize those who were impatiently waiting for his death. Even those who loved their enemies hated him, their friend—the friend of the whole world—with all their hearts.

On the 8th of June, 1809, death came—Death, almost his only friend.

At his funeral no pomp, no pageantry, no civic procession, no military display. In a carriage, a woman and her son who had lived on the bounty of the dead—on horseback, a Quaker, the humanity of whose heart dominated the creed of his head—and, following on foot, two negroes, filled with gratitude—constituted the funeral cortege of Thomas Paine.

He who had received the gratitude of many millions, the thanks of generals and statesmen—he who had been the friend and companion of the wisest and best—he who had taught a people to be free, and whose words had inspired armies and enlightened nations, was thus given back to Nature, the mother of us all.

If the people of the great Republic knew the life of this generous, this chivalric man, the real story of his services, his sufferings and his triumphs—of what he did to compel the robed and crowned, the priests and kings, to give back to the people liberty, the jewel of the soul; if they knew that he was the first to write, "The Religion of Humanity"; if they knew that he, above all others, planted and watered the seeds of independence, of union, of nationality, in the hearts of our forefathers—that his words were gladly repeated by the best and bravest in many lands; if they knew that he attempted, by the purest means, to attain the noblest and loftiest ends—that he was original, sincere, intrepid, and that he could truthfully say: "The world is my country, to do good my religion"—if the people only knew all this—the truth—they would repeat the words of Andrew Jackson: "Thomas Paine needs no monument made with hands; he has erected a monument in the hearts of all lovers of liberty."

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

THE POPE AT HOME.

BY GIOVANNI AMADI.

THE following anecdote was circulated in Perugia and all through Italy at the time of the election of Pope Leo XIII.: During the political disturbances which accompanied and followed the establishment of United Italy, Francesco Crispi, then member of Parliament from Palermo, had several interviews on business with Cardinal Joachim Pecci, then Archbishop of Perugia. On one of these occasions the cardinal said to Crispi: "You are a very able man, and a splendid career is open to you. The day is near when you will be a minister, perhaps Prime Minister to the King." "I accept the omen," Crispi replied, "but when I shall be Premier you will be Pope." The prediction was fulfilled on both sides in February, 1878.

Carpeneto, where Leo XIII. was born on March 2, 1810, more than eighty-one years ago, is a picturesque, straggling village of 5,000 souls, located in a gap of the Volscian Mountains—the Monti Lepini of the present day—at the foot of the Semprevisa peak, which towers to the height of 2,700 feet. According to a poetic description by the late Cardinal Joseph Pecci, the Pope's brother, Carpeneto looks like an eagle's nest perched on a ledge between two gigantic rocks. The villa Pecci, an imposing edifice of the sixteenth century, stands on one of the heights between the village and the summit of the mountain, surrounded by chestnut trees and humble mediæval houses. The place is secluded and pleasant, at the same time adapted to studious pursuits under healthful conditions. Indeed "*mens sana in corpore sano*" may be said to be the device of the Counts Pecci.

The Counts Pecci were among the leading families of the republic of Siena. Banished by party feuds, in the first half of the sixteenth century, they migrated to the pontifical states, and settled in Carpeneto. Several ancestors of the present Pope have

made themselves known in history. His father, Count Ludovico, an officer under Napoleon I., married the Countess Anna Prosperi Buzi, a good and noble lady, by whom he had four male children. The future Pope, the fourth son, was called Vincenzo, at his mother's request, but after her death he exchanged the name for that of Joachim. When eight years old he began his education in the Jesuits' college at Viterbo, where he was first imbued with a passionate love for classic poetry. In 1832 he entered the *Accademia Ecclesiastica* for young priests destined for diplomatic and administrative careers, and made such rapid progress in the study of civil and ecclesiastic law that in 1835 he received the highest prize, of sixty sequins, in a competition among his fellow students. There were one hundred subjects for discussion placed in a glass box, and each of the young academicians had to draw one and develop it *impromptu*. The subject drawn by Joachim Pecci was "On the Right of Appeal to the Person of the Pope." A competitor of his, an Irishman named Tobias Kirby, now Archbishop of Ephesus, calling on the recently elected Pope forty-three years afterwards, said in the course of the conversation: "Holy Father, I have just found among my papers my dispute of 1835." The Pope was so pleased that he caused Mgr. Kirby to publish it, with a dedication to the winner of the competition.

In 1837 Rome had a great visitation—an outbreak of Asiatic cholera, which carried off 12,563 persons in about four months. Joachim Pecci, who had just been named "domestic prelate" by Gregory XVI., showed great presence of mind and great charity in organizing help for the panic-stricken crowds. He was ordained a priest in November of that eventful year, and celebrated his first mass on January 1, 1838. Fifty years later, on January 1, 1888, he was able to celebrate his golden mass, under the canopy of Urban VIII., in the Basilica of St. Peter's, and give his apostolic benediction to a crowd of thirty thousand persons. He received for this golden mass a fee of $200,000,* and six million dollars in gifts and presents of various kinds.

The next step in his career was the governorship of the province of Benevento. This region was then agitated by civil discord, and infested by bands of brigands from the neighboring Neapolitan provinces. The leading land-

* The ordinary fee for a low mass in Italy is fifty cents.

owners either had intrenched themselves in their castles, enlisting companies of armed men to protect their persons and their belongings, or had entered into a compromise with the brigands, supplying them with food, spirits, tobacco, and information about the movements of the police. The new governor changed at once the state of affairs. The leader of the outlaws, Pasquale Colletta, was caught and executed; and his supporters, whether noblemen or peasants, were prosecuted. One of the nobility, a marquis of high-sounding name, on being warned by Mgr. Pecci to cut short his communication with the brigands, gave him a haughty answer, whereupon Monsignore had him marched off to prison, together with the brigands to whom he had offered hospitality and help.

In 1843 Mgr. Pecci was promoted to the *nunziatura*, or legation, at Brussels. Belgium was not an easy post for a representative of the Pope, King Leopold being of a rather sceptical turn of mind and having peculiar views as to civil and constitutional rights. Still the young *nuncio*, by his exquisite tact, aristocratic manners, and vast culture, succeeded in winning the sympathies of the court, and became an intimate friend and adviser of the King. His conversation was full of *finesse* and humor. Once, sitting at the royal table, he was annoyed by the rather easy conversation of a diplomat who kept expatiating on his success in society, and was showing the picture of a *dame du grand monde*, beautiful as a work of art, but not quite modest. In the hope of teasing the young *nuncio*, he passed the picture to him, asking his opinion of it. Monsignore looked at the portrait most indifferently, and giving it back to its owner, said in a loud tone, so as to be heard by the King: "Very fine! is it the portrait of your wife?"

After a journey through the United Kingdom, undertaken to study the organization of the Anglican Church, he was named Archbishop of Perugia, and Cardinal. His residence of thirty-two years in the beautiful city of Perugia, his wise, prudent, and charitable administration of the diocese, will never be forgotten. He was very strict and exacting in all questions concerning the seminary, and kept a vigilant eye on teachers and students. One morning the professor of literature, Geremia Brunetti, was prevented by an unforeseen circumstance from taking the chair

at the appointed hour. On entering the school, twenty minutes later, he was astonished to find the cardinal archbishop explaining from his own chair an obscure passage in Cicero. The professor sat in confusion among his pupils until the lecture was over.

One of the leading officers in the government of the Holy See is that of Cardinal *Camerlengo*, who exercises the supreme power in the interval between the death of the Pope and the election of his successor. Cardinal Pecci was made Camerlengo on September 21, 1877, and four months later he had the ungrateful opportunity of exercising his power. From the hour of the death of Pius IX. till the meeting of the conclave, he showed so much energy and severity in the administration of the Vatican palace that all the officers, educated to the mild rule of Pius IX., were struck with awe, and expected hourly to lose their appointments. On February 18, 1878, the conclave—the first held since the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy—met in the Vatican. Of the sixty-four cardinals, composing at that time the electoral assembly, only three were absent—Cardinals Broussais de St. Marc and Cullen, both sick in bed, and Cardinal McCloskey, on his way to Rome. The hall of the conclave presented an imposing aspect. There were four green canopies for the four surviving princes of the church named under Gregory XVI., and sixty purple ones for those named under Pius IX. On the first ballot Joachim Pecci polled twenty-three votes; on the second, thirty-eight: however, a majority of two-thirds being required by the canons, a third ballot was taken and the Archbishop of Perugia was elected Pope by the almost unanimous consent of the electors. The green and purple canopies were at once removed, and the *nuntio vobis gaudium magnum* of Cardinal Caterini proclaimed to the world that the two hundred and sixty-third successor of St. Peter in the bishopric of Rome, Leo XIII., had taken possession of the government of the church. The first benediction given by him to the multitudes assembled in the largest temple of Christendom was a marvellous sight, never to be forgotten by the living generation. On his retiring for rest to his apartment he wrote the following letter to his family :*

"My Dear Brethren:

"This morning the Sacred College has elected my humble and unworthy

* Charles, John Baptist, and Joseph, now all deceased.

person to the chair of St. Peter. My first letter is addressed to you, dear brethren, and to my family, upon which I implore the blessings of heaven. Do pray earnestly and constantly for me."

From the very first acts of his administration he showed two leading qualities—clearness of ideas in every social and diplomatic question; moderation and tact in discharging his duties. Pius IX. had influenced and fascinated the masses; Leo XIII. turned his efforts towards the governments, and succeeded in winning their confidence and admiration. Take, for example, the case of Germany, whose leaders, at the time of Leo's election, were involved in the *Kulturkampf*, waging a fierce war against the Catholic clergy. Firmness, joined to a marvellous *savoir-faire*, very soon gave the victory to the Pope; and it was Bismarck himself, the iron chancellor, that suggested him as the arbitrator in the international difficulties between Germany and Spain.

Let us now turn our attention to the Pope's daily life and to other intimate details.

In summer, as in winter, Leo XIII. is awakened at six by his private servant, Francesco Centra, from Carpeneto. Centra knocks at the door, opens the blinds, addresses a customary salute to his master, and at once retires. The Pope gets up from bed unaided, and also performs his toilet unaided, except as regards shaving. This operation is performed by the faithful Centra. The bedroom is not the one used as such by his predecessors; it is a small and rather low cell in the *mezzanino* or *entre sol*, to which he repaired many years ago in the course of some restorations to the old room, and where he has remained ever since. At seven o'clock he says his mass, attended by two *cappellani segreti*, and hears a second mass celebrated by one of the same attendants, who act also as private secretaries. It happens sometimes that the Pope, having been troubled with sleeplessness, gets up with a piece of Latin or Italian poetry composed during the wakeful hours. The verses are generally dictated to one of the secretaries before the mass. The breakfast of the Pope consists of coffee, milk, and bread without butter. Soon after, the official reception begins. The first one, as a rule, is given to the Cardinal Secretary of State, who submits to the Holy Father the documents received the day before, or those which are awaiting the pontifical signature. This audience lasts more than an hour, and takes place every day except Tuesdays and Fridays, which are set apart for the reception of

the diplomatic body. Cardinals, heads of congregations, generals of monastic orders, strangers of distinction, are received later in the day. It is to be regretted that Leo XIII. does not accord private audiences as often as his predecessors did. Many strangers are obliged to leave Rome without having been able to see the Holy Father. In winter, if the sun shines, the receptions are interrupted for a while for a walk or a drive of half an hour in the Vatican gardens. Leo XIII. dines at one o'clock in the old Roman style. The dinner is composed of a soup, generally *pâte d'Italie*, a roast, a vegetable, very often fried potatoes, and fruit. Pius IX. was very fond of boiled meat, which was served to him daily in a triple form,—boiled chicken, boiled beef, and boiled mutton. This plate is banished from Leo's table, as well as bacon and cheese. The only wine served is old Bordeaux.

The Pope is very apt to glance over the journals at meal times. He dines alone generally, waited upon, in addition to the valet, by his *scalco segreto*, or carver, Commendatore Giulio Sterbini. This official is a gentleman of refined tastes and artistic culture, owning a good collection of pre-Raphaelite pictures. An invitation to take coffee and milk after the Pope's mass is considered a great honor, and it is only extended to those who have heard the mass and received the holy communion from the Pope's hands. It has lately been granted to the ex-Grand Duchess of Tuscany and to the Princes Borghese, Aldobrandini, Altieri, and Ludovisi. The same favor is shown sometimes to the nephews of the Pope. In all cases the visitors sit at a small table placed next to the Pope's. After dinner Leo XIII. takes a short rest on a *chaise longue*, the siesta never lasting beyond the hour. Then follows a drive in the Belvedere gardens, through which an avenue more than a mile long has lately been opened, affording many lovely points of view over the city and its suburbs. The Holy Father, attended by a *camerière segreto* and an officer of the *Guardia Nobile*, stops very often in the enclosure of a vineyard planted six years ago under his supervision. This vineyard is cultivated by the pupils of an agricultural school formed by Pius IX., and accordingly named Vigna Pia. If he finds among the workers an intelligent lad he enters into a friendly talk with him. At six o'clock, after granting other audiences, he takes a cup of bouillon and a glass of Bordeaux.

Evenings are generally devoted to study and writing. The

literary, or mental, work of the Pope is really prodigious. He prefers to dictate to his secretaries from notes which are prepared on a number of small scraps of paper. These scraps are afterwards torn into a thousand fragments, to prevent their being saved, given away, or sold as autographs. This sort of commerce, which under Pius IX. had assumed vast proportions, has been rendered impossible by the care Leo takes in destroying his own manuscripts. This is the reason why he never allows a soul to enter his room when he is not present, not even his faithful Centra. Papers of every description and importance lie scattered everywhere, even upon the bed.

When there is urgency in the work confided to one of the secretaries, the Pope confines him in a room adjoining his own library, supplies him with the proper writing materials, documents, and books, and goes away, putting in his pocket the key of the room. The prisoner, however, is not forgotten; after two or three hours he hears the key turning again in the lock and sees the good Pope come quietly in with a bottle of excellent wine and a few biscuits. After examining the state of the work, the august visitor says a few words to stimulate the activity of the writer, offers him the refreshments, and soon leaves again, taking with him his bottle and his biscuits.

The consciousness of his own immense strength in literary work makes the Pope sometimes too exacting with persons possessed of weaker fibre. He sent once for a monsignore and asked him to draw up a report on the Catholic schools in Rome, the number of their pupils, the nature of the instruction given, the progress attained, a comparison with the municipal schools, etc. His instructions ended with these words: "Will you kindly bring me the report this evening?"

Imagine the stupefaction of the monsignore, as there are in Rome 150 Catholic schools, frequented by 15,000 pupils.

Seeing his embarrassment, the Pope said: "Well, I ask perhaps too much. Bring the report to-morrow."

Sometimes it happens that the work, either from its political importance or its difficulty, must be done by the Pope himself. In this case he shuts himself up, forbids even knocking at his door, and gets so absorbed that sometimes he wipes his pen on the white sleeve of his immaculate robe. Knowing of this habit, the faithful Centra never fails to examine the sleeves on audience

days, and always has ready a change of apparel, in case the spots are too apparent.

When the night work is over the Pope sends for Mgr. Martolino, to whom for years he has been greatly attached, and recites with him the rosary. Between half-past ten and eleven o'clock, before going to bed, he takes another cup of consommé, a bit of cold meat saved from the dinner, and the usual glass of Bordeaux. The regular hour for retiring is eleven o'clock. The Pope does not enjoy calm sleep, especially when he has overfatigued himself during the day or when there are sudden changes in the weather.

Leo XIII. is very reticent, even when he holds familiar receptions in the library or in the *Loggie* of Raphael. He is afraid, no doubt, that his words may be misconstrued or misrepresented, believing that "speech is of silver and silence of gold." In case of a lull, the silence is broken by a number of noisy little birds caged in the library itself; their singing and twittering being sometimes strong enough to annoy everybody and make the speaker lose the thread of his discourse, but on the Pope it has no effect whatever.

So many strange reports are circulated about the finances of the Vatican and the sums of money which the Pope has at his personal disposal that it seems wise to give a glance at the exact state of affairs, based on the last budget of the Holy See. I do not intend to give, and could not give if willing, an account of every franc and centime, the estimates below, in round figures, representing the average annual expense of the last few years :

	Lire.	Dollars.
1. At the personal disposal of the Pope	500,000	100,000
2. For the cardinals	700,000	140,000
3. For poor and needy bishoprics	460,000	92,000
4. Administration af apostolic palaces	1,800,000	360,000
5. Secretaries of state, diplomacy, etc	1,000,000	200,000
6. Employees	1,500,000	300,000
7. Schools and charitable institutions	1,200,000	240,000
Total	7,160,000	1,432,000

The half million lire ($100,000) at the disposal of the Pope is spent for his own household, table, linen, private servants, and other items of a personal character. The Pope is exceedingly frugal in his table expenses, which never exceed the sum of fifty dollars per month. It was quite different under Pius IX., not that he was more fond of the luxuries of the table, but on account of the unlimited freedom that he gave to the kitchen department. This state of things is illustrated by the following story :

Cardinal Antonelli, in revising the accounts one day, found that twenty-five bales or big sacks of charcoal had been put down in the book as used in one month. He struck off fifteen from the list, informing the pontifical valet that ten would suffice. After a few days the Pope complained to his *grand échanson*, or cup-bearer, Count Filippani, that the *cuisine* was not up to the mark. Count Filippani went immediately to the kitchen to make inquiries. "How can I do honor to myself," was the chief cook's answer, "without the proper amount of fuel?" The reply had its effect. Informed of what had passed, the Pope immediately restored the twenty-five bales of charcoal, and said: "Don't make economies at the expense of my good fare. A sovereign is bound to be *exploité*."

Another item in the personal budget is to be found in the presents offered from time to time to sovereigns and persons of high title and distinction; these presents often take the shape of a mosaic picture reproducing some famous original of the Vatican galleries; more seldom of a tapestry or *arazzo* from cartoons of eminent artists. There are establishments for mosaic and tapestry work in the palace itself. The manufactory of mosaics (*studio del mosaico*), located in the east wing of Bramante's quadrangle, is under the management of the Archbishop of Melitene, Mgr. de Nekere, and under the artistic guidance of Professors Francesco Grandi and Salvatore Nobili. The number of enamels of different colors and shades owned by the establishment amounts to ten thousand. Some idea of the difficulty of the process required to invest with durability these reproductions of masterpieces may be formed from the fact that many of the large pictures have taken from twelve to twenty years for their execution; that the smaller ones, from three to five feet square, require five or six years; and that the rough portraits of the popes, such as ornament the frieze of the Basilica of St. Paul outside-the-walls can seldom be completed in less than twelve months.

The manufactory of tapestries (*scuola degli arazzi*) is under the directorship of Professor Pietro Gentili, whose principal function is to keep in good order the magnificent collection of Raphael's tapestries, which is exhibited in the west wing of Bramante's quadrangle, in a corridor which divides the gallery of candelabras from that of geographical maps. The tapestries are divided into two series. The first, called *arazzi della scuola vecchia*,

comprises ten specimens executed in Flanders by Bernhard van Orley from cartoons designed by Raphael himself and by his favorite pupil, Francesco Penni. Seven of these cartoons are preserved at Hampton Court palace near London, having been purchased in the Low Countries by Charles I. The second series, that of the *scuola nuova*, was executed at a later period from the designs of Giulio Romano. The keeping in order of these masterpieces is not a sinecure; the collection having had many narrow escapes, and having repeatedly sustained serious injuries. In 1527, when Rome was stormed by the ferocious hordes of the Constable de Bourbon, the tapestries were stolen from the apostolic palace; and when the Constable Anne de Montmorency restored them to the Vatican, in 1553, some valuable portions had been lost forever. A similar fate befell the collection in 1798: it was carried off by the French revolutionists and sold to a Jewish dealer at Genoa. This brute burned one of the tapestries for the sake of the gold and silver threads used in the bright-lights. The speculation having proved a failure, the Jew offered to return the tapestries to Pius VII. in 1808. They were doomed, however, to suffer from French hostile hands for the third time. In 1849, during the bombardment of the city by General Oudinot's artillery, two shells penetrated the gallery: one struck the bare wall; the other fell at the foot of the "Miraculous Draught of Fishes."

Another item of expenditure is to be found in the bestowment of the insignia or decorations of the pontifical equestrian orders. These orders are five in number. The highest and oldest was instituted on August 14, 1318, by Denis, King of Portugal, and confirmed in 1320 by Pope John XXII. It is conferred only on royalty, or personages of high distinction; Prince Bismarck, having received it in recognition of his services to the cause of peace, after seeking the Pope's arbitration in Germany's dispute with Spain about the Caroline Islands. Then comes the order of the Holy Tomb (*Santo Sepolcro*), the institution of which is contemporary with that of the order of St. John of Jerusalem. It is conferred, on behalf of the Holy See, by the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The third order was founded in September, 1831, by Gregory XVI., and named from St. Gregory the Great; the fourth by the same, in October, 1841, and named from St. Sylvester; the fifth and last by Pope

Pius IX., in June, 1847, for members of different religious creeds. As a rule, when one of these last mentioned knighthoods is conferred, no insignia are sent with the papal *breve* (brief, letter) of nomination, but only a plate is inclosed containing the model, or *figurino*, of the uniform to be worn at state ceremonies or official and diplomatic receptions. Many American citizens have been knighted in this way by the Pope.

The second item of the budget as I have given it, amounting to 700,000 lire ($140,000), relates to the college of cardinals. This college is composed *de jure* of seventy members, but there are actually six vacancies, by which the *plenum* of cardinals is reduced to 64. They are divided into three classes or "orders"—cardinal-bishops, cardinal-priests, and cardinal-deacons. The first class is composed of six members, their bishoprics being all in the vicinity of Rome (suburban seats); the second, of forty-eight; the third, of ten. Of the sixty-four members of the sacred college, thirty-four are Italians, thirty foreigners. Among these last, five belong to the Anglo-Saxon race, namely, Edward Howard, Bishop of Frascati; Henry Edward Manning,* Archbishop of Westminster; Patrick Frank Moran, Archbishop of Sydney; Alexander Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec; James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. The cardinals, as a rule, are very old men, only thirteen of them being under sixty. The oldest is Theodolph Mertel, born at Civita Vecchia in 1806; the youngest is Camillo di Rende, born at Naples in 1847. The annuity of 20,000 lire ($4,000) is paid not only to the cardinals *in curia*,—that is to say, to those residing in Rome,—but also to those on active duty abroad. The only cardinal who, not being a bishop in active service, was allowed to reside far away from the curia, was the late John Henry Newman, upon whom the privilege of living in Birmingham, notwithstanding his position in the sacred college, was bestowed by Leo XIII.

The annuity of $4,000 is very small indeed, if we consider the duties and burdens which the position of a prince of the church involves, and the necessity of living with imposing dignity.

The expenses for poor and needy dioceses ($92,000) are to be understood in this way: There are states in Europe in which, either by laws of parliament or by the will of the sovereign, Catholic bishops have been deprived of their endowment in real

* Deceased January 14, 1892.

estate. These titulars receive a salary, like any other employee or official of the state, the amount of the salary being always three, five, or even ten times inferior to the former revenues of their episcopal see. The same course has been adopted in some countries as regards the property of seminaries, parishes, and other religious institutions. The sum of $92,000 is required, as an average, for these poor dioceses in Italy, Poland, Switzerland, etc.

The organization of the episcopate in the Catholic Church requires a few words of explanation. There are ten patriarchs, eight hundred and thirty-five resident, and three hundred and eight titular (*in partibus*) bishops and archbishops, and seven prelates having no see (*nullius*). The metropolitan sees of the United States are thirteen—Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Santa Fé, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Oregon City, and St. Paul. The suffragan sees are sixty-nine in number.

Under the head of "Prefecture of the Apostolic Palaces" comes the expense for keeping and improving the edifices belonging to the Holy See and caring for their invaluable collections of works of art. The Vatican palace alone, begun in the time of Charlemagne, and improved and enlarged by every Pope in succession, occupies a rectangular space 1,200 feet long and 800 wide. The number of its halls, chambers, and galleries, almost exceeds belief; it has eight grand staircases, two hundred smaller ones, twenty courts, and *four thousand four hundred and twenty-two* rooms. Many of these apartments have been decorated and painted *à fresco* by such artists as Luca Signorelli, Sandro Botticelli, Perugino, Ghirlandaio, Fra Angelico, Michaelangelo, Raffaello, etc. The art collections which they contain are priceless. There is a museum of Latin and Greek inscriptions, numbering upwards of 3,000 specimens; a museum of statuary, numbering many thousand statues, groups, busts, bas-reliefs, urns, sarcophagi, etc.; a "Hall of the Animals," containing two hundred and fifty admirable figures of quadrupeds, reptiles, sea monsters, fantastic animals, etc.; a gallery of marble candelabra; an Etruscan, an Egyptian, and a Christian museum; a gallery of geographical maps; a gallery of tapestries; a pinacotheca, or gallery of pictures, which, although specially limited in its scope, is considered the finest in the world; a library containing 24,000 manuscripts and 200,000 printed books—archives in which the

history of the world of the last five centuries can be studied in its most intimate and delicate details.

The present Pope, following the footsteps of his predecessors, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX., has shown great generosity in improving the collections of the Vatican palace. Thus the beautiful *galleria dei candelabri*, 300 feet long, has been decorated with frescoes by Frederic Seitz, and with a mosaic pavement; the museum of statuary has received, among other additions, the Apollo discovered in 1884 in the villa of Quintus Voconius Pollis, near Frascati, and the Semo Sanctus, discovered in 1882 near the Colonna gardens on the Quirinal. The collection of printed books, formerly inaccessible to students, has been rearranged in a new hall; an astronomical observatory for the photographic study of the skies has been built on the top of one of the towers of Leo IV.; and the perusal of the documents kept in the archives has been granted to the public.

Besides the Vatican palace and gardens, the Pope owns other costly residences and establishments, such as the Lateran, with its Christian and pagan museums; the *palazzo della cancellaria*, in which the offices of the various sacred congregations are located; the summer resort of Castel Gandolfo on the Alban Hills, etc. Leo XIII. has spent $1,200,000 in the Lateran alone for the enlargement and embellishment of the choir and of the cloisters.

The sum of $200,000 is placed at the disposition of the Secretary of State, Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, for the diplomatic service. The Holy See is represented abroad by four ambassadors (*nuncii*) residing, respectively, in Vienna, Paris, Madrid, and Lisbon; by two ministers plenipotentiary, residing in Munich and Brussels, besides other representatives in Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Brazil, Colombia, etc.

I shall close this short article on the Pope, his court and administration, by referring to one of the remarkable points of his character, his great love for poetry. In spite of old age, of many and telling cares and anxieties, and of broken health, his poetic vein, the freshness and vigor of his mind, seem to be inexhaustible. His mastery of the Latin classics enables him to write with the graceful ease of the great poets of the Renaissance. I have here on my desk a small *anthologia* of the latest productions of the pontifical muse. Among the leading literary societies of Rome, there is one called the *Arcadia*, of which Leo XIII., before

his election as Pope, was an active member, under the pseudonym of Neander Heracleus. On the occasion of a solemn meeting, held on December 16, 1890, to celebrate the second centennial of the academy, the Pope sent his greetings in the form of two Latin epigrams. I beg to quote one of them *in extenso* for the perusal of young American students, reminding them that it is written by a poet nearly eighty-two years of age :

ad sodales Arcadicos
altero post collegium institutum
exeunte saeculo
Leo xiii p. m.
(Neander Heracleus.)

E vaticana vos, Arcades, arce Neander
Olim quem socium dulcis alebat amor
Pieridum, salvere iubet, iuga laeta Heliconis
Scandere, Mæoniis ludere carminibus.
Addit vota libens : in longum floreat ævum
Nominis Arcadici gloria, priscus honos.

Better still, for tenderness of feeling and elegance of expression, is a poem written by him in 1890, on the occasion of the death of his brother, Cardinal Joseph Pecci. The tone of the eulogy is delicate and refined, and faith in the blessings which await the just in the future life is firmly and affectionately expressed. The poem has the form of a dialogue between the Pope and his brother in heaven :

Joseph.—Justitiæ factum satis est : admissa piavi :
iam Cœli me templa tenent stellantia : sed tu
cum tot sustineas tam grandia munia, debes
tanto plura Deo, quanto maiora tulisti.
Sume animum ! fideus cymbam duc æquor in altum:
Sic tibi felices, largo sic fenore digni
sint initi sancta pro religione labores !
Altamen, ut valeas olim sublimia cœli,
Ultrices fugiens flammas, attingere, prudens
mortali. IOACHIM, vitæ dum vesceris aura
quidquid peccatum est, lacrimis delere memento.

To which the Pope answers :

Ioachim.—Dum vivam, fessoque regat dum spiritus artus,
Enitar genitu lacrimisque abstergere culpas.
At tu, qui Superum securus luce beatis
confectum ærumnis, devexa ætate labantem
erige, et usque memor de cœlo respice fratrem,
quem turbo heu ! dudum premit horridus, horrida dudum
fluctibus in mediis commota procella fatigat.

GIOVANNI AMADI.

BUSINESS IN PRESIDENTIAL YEARS.

BY F. B. THURBER.

THERE is a general impression that "a Presidential year is a bad year for business," and, as with most general impressions, there is some foundation for it. Large enterprises depending, in a measure, upon the policy of the government, are held in waiting before new works are undertaken or those already under way extended; and the prominence given to "politics" by the press tends to distract attention from business and concentrate it upon public affairs.

Aside from this, however, the great business of demand and supply goes on without much change. People eat, and drink, and wear as much in a Presidential year as they do in other years, and there are other conditions which often have more real influence upon business than politics have, which are overlooked, or whose effect is attributed to a cause wholly different from the real one.

The present situation is an anomalous one in the business world. With an enormous harvest in this country and a deficient one abroad, a "boom year" was expected by most persons; but on the contrary the results, this year, have thus far been generally disappointing.

The supply of principal staples proved too great for the demand, and prices declined to a point where the greater crop yielded positively less to the producer than a smaller one with better prices would have done.

This was a great disappointment to producers, although of positive benefit to the consumers of these staples, and, in so far as the consumers are residents of this country, the benefits will gradually become apparent.

Low prices for cotton in the South, or for grain in the West,

mean a better living for the people of the more thickly settled portions of our country, a larger purchasing power for our citizens, an increased demand for articles of comfort or of luxury.

High prices for these staples, with a smaller production, may mean as large a return, or even a larger return, to producers, but less comfort and prosperity to consumers.

Thus, one section of our country may be benefited by what is of no benefit to another; yet, as a whole, plenty benefits more than scarcity.

Railroads and other carriers are important factors in the general prosperity, and in years of plenty these have more business and are more prosperous than in lean years; this stimulates them to make extensions and to add to their facilities, which, in turn, lead to increased activities in many lines of business.

Sentiment has a powerful influence upon business, notwithstanding the proverb that "there is no sentiment in business." The silver question is an illustration of this. It is safe to say that an infinitely greater number of new business enterprises await the settlement of this question than any other upon which the Presidential election has a bearing. There is a feeling among investors—the men who furnish the money for large business enterprises—that they "want to go slow," until this question is out of the way.

This sentiment may not be well founded, and indeed the effect of free silver is probably overestimated, but the sentiment exists, and the men who are agitating for "free silver" are retarding business activities and preventing the investment of capital in this country, however just their contention may be.

It may be well, in passing, to remark upon the merits of the silver question, that, from the standpoint of a looker-on, it seems as if the silver men were trying to reverse the law of supply and demand. Power drills, stamp mills, and improved separating processes have largely increased the world's output of silver, at a time when public sentiment in some countries is working against silver as a currency and in favor of a less bulky and more convenient medium of exchange.

The production of gold has not increased so rapidly, and, in consequence, silver has depreciated, while gold has appreciated in value.

We have sought in this country to keep the two metals on a

parity, by having the government buy up the surplus of silver; but this cannot go on forever.

The great forces which now control the world—steam, electricity, and machinery—are unifying the nations more closely than ever before, and "the field is the world" more truly in a business sense than at any previous period. A financial disturbance in one part of the world is instantaneously felt in the others, through the telegraphic nerve system of the business body.

The great steamers which ply backward and forward across the oceans with the regularity of ferryboats are like shuttles in the loom, weaving the nations together in bonds of common interest; the locomotive merges the fertile furrow of the prairie farm in the closing furrow of the sea. The tides and currents of population, set in motion by these great forces, ebb and flow with constantly increasing strength, and the question once asked in the hall of Congress "What have we to do with Europe?" is daily growing more absurd.

The silver question can only be settled by the principal nations agreeing upon a ratio at which silver shall be interchangeable with gold, and if the disparity between the amounts of these two metals produced and consumed continues, the new ratio may have to be again revised in a few years.

The effect of labor-saving machinery upon business is perhaps not sufficiently appreciated. So enormously have our manufacturing and producing facilities increased that our consuming power has not kept pace with them, and the result is more frequent periods of overstocked markets and of commercial depression than formerly.

The inventive faculty of Americans is simply wonderful, and millions of busy brains are all the time working upon problems in the line of increasing production and decreasing cost. No want is left unsupplied; indeed, wants are constantly suggested or created for the profit of the inventor.

Doubtless the protection extended to inventors by our patent laws, under which some enormous fortunes have been made, has had much to do with stimulating the activities of a naturally ingenious race; but no matter to what it is due, the fact remains that machinery is rapidly taking the place of human labor, necessitating a constant readjustment of occupations, and presenting a series of kaleidoscopic problems, both to the business men and the statesmen of the day.

No sooner has the latest ocean-racer broken the record than a new one is launched to beat it. New processes and devices in every department of human activity make their appearance, have their day and make way for an improvement. Nails used to be slowly and laboriously hammered from pieces of iron; then came a machine which cut them from iron plates; now they are made from steel wire rods by a machine which cuts them the desired lengths, points them and heads them faster than a chicken can pick up corn.

It is not many years since the winter season meant a narrow range of diet for the masses, and a great lack of anti-scorbutic food, but the improvements made in preserving fruits and vegetables in tins have been such that these articles are now found upon the tables of all classes at all seasons.

Every industry creates new wants and new industries, an illustration of this being the manufacture of can-openers, which, under the great development of the canned-goods industry became a large business in itself; but now this is being pushed aside by self opening devices for tin cans, which seem likely to entirely supplant the can-opener.

For a time it seemed as if we had reached an age when the organization of industry demanded that all work should be done in large factories with ponderous machinery driven by steam power, and the labor so divided that all individuality of labor was lost; but during the past few years distribution of power has been made possible by electricity and also by compressed air, and close observers are looking forward to a period in the near future when the power of every waterfall, and even that of the tides, will be utilized and transmitted, and divided, until every mechanic can have one or more horse-power in his own household—"horse-power" which it takes no room to stable and which eats nothing when not in use—and the smaller industries will again be diffused instead of being absorbed and grouped together, as has been the tendency during the last few decades.

Even now the waters of Niagara Falls are being harnessed by the construction of a tunnel costing millions of dollars, and within a twelvemonth it is expected that electric power will be vivifying the industries of the city of Buffalo at a cost below anything heretofore attainable, and, at the same time, yielding large returns to the capital engaged in furnishing the power.

In such an age of evolution and change it is very hard to keep track of and judge correctly of cause and effect, and, in considering the influence of Presidential elections upon business, we are very apt to overlook many other conditions which either directly or indirectly contribute to results.

If we turn to statistics we do not find much comfort. The figures of the New York Clearing House probably furnish as good an idea of the state of business throughout the United States as any. All the business activities of the country are focalized here, and "Wall Street" is a barometer for trade and commerce, as well as finance.

Statistics show that in 1872, a Presidential year, the exchanges were three billions of dollars more than in 1871, and only a billion less than the succeeding year. In 1876, however, there were three billions less than in 1875, and one billion less than in 1877, but in 1880 there were thirteen billions more than in 1879, but eleven billions less than in 1881, when we had a "boom" year, owing to the good crops in this country and poor ones abroad.

Whatever incubus a Presidential election might have been upon business, that year it was borne like a feather upon the crest of a tidal wave.

The volume of exchanges steadily declined from 1881 until 1885, but in the Presidential year of 1884 the exchanges were nine billions more than in 1885, from which point there was a substantial recovery again during 1886 and 1887, but in 1888 they declined again four billions.

In 1889 they increased four billions, and in 1890 three billions, declining again in 1891 about three and one-half billions.

The exact figures are given in the following table:

AMOUNT OF THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE NEW YORK CLEARING HOUSE FROM 1870 TO 1891, INCLUSIVE. (PRESIDENTIAL YEARS IN HEAVY TYPE.)

Year ending October 1:	Exchanges for the Year. Dollars.	Year ending Oct. 1:	Exchanges for the Year. Dollars.
1870	27,804,539,405.75	1881	48.585,818 212.31
1871	29,300 986,682.21	1882	46.552,846,161.00
1872	**32,636,997,103.83**	1883	40,293,165,257.65
1873	33.972.773,942.97	**1884**	**34,092,037,338.00**
1874	20,850,683,962.82	1885	25,250.791,440.00
1875	23.042,276,858.47	1886	33,374,682,216.00
1876	**19,874,815,360.61**	1887	34 872,848,786.00
1877	20.876,555,936.71	**1888**	**30,863,686,609.00**
1878	19.92',733,946.59	1889	34.796 465,528.87
1879	24,553,196 688.88	1890	37,660,686,571.76
1880	**37,182,128,621.09**	1891	34,053,698,770.04

RAILROAD BUILDING.

The number of miles of railroads constructed has been considered an indication of business prosperity or otherwise, but an examination of statistics of railroad building in Presidential years furnishes so many exceptions to the idea that a Presidential election is a controlling, or even an important, factor that it tends to make a person sceptical.

The exact figures are given in the following table :

NUMBER OF MILES OF RAILROAD CONSTRUCTED IN THE UNITED STATES EACH YEAR FROM 1870 TO 1891, INCLUSIVE. (PRESIDENTIAL YEARS IN HEAVY TYPE.)

(From Poor's Railroad Manual.)

Year.	Miles.	Year.	Miles.	Year.	Miles.
1870	6,070	1878	2,629	1885	3,608
1871	7,379	1879	4,746	1886	9,000
1872	**5,878**	**1880**	**6,876**	1887	11,926
1873	4,097	1881	9,796	**1888**	**7,088**
1874	2,117	1882	11,568	1889	4,221
1875	1,711	1883	6,741	1890	7,343
1876	**2,712**	**1884**	**3,825**	1891	3,507
1877	2,280				

BUSINESS FAILURES.

The number of business failures as reported by Dun's and Bradstreet's mercantile agencies seem to be somewhat more favorable to the theory that a Presidential election has a depressing effect upon business, although the figures tell contradictory stories.

MERCANTILE FAILURES FOR TWENTY-TWO YEARS. (PRESIDENTIAL YEARS IN HEAVY TYPE.)

Year.	Number of failures.	Year.	Number of failures.
1871	2,915	1882	6,738
1872	**4,069**	1883	9,184
1873	5,183	**1884**	**10,968**
1874	5,830	1885	10,637
1875	7,740	1886	9,834
1876	**9,092**	1887	9,634
1877	8,872	**1888**	**10,679**
1878	10,478	1889	10,882
1878	6,658	1890	10,907
1880	**4,735**	1891	12,273
1881	5,582		

The summing up of all these figures leads to the opinion expressed in the opening lines of this article, that while a Presidential election has some influence upon some kinds of business, there are other influences far more controlling in their nature.

A superficial observer might attribute the present failure to realize the boom which was expected from our great harvests of 1891, to the pending Presidential election ; but it seems probable that the silver question and the low prices obtained for our products have much more to do with it. Indeed, the question of *low prices* seems to be the most interesting one before us to-day.

The silver men tell us that it is due to the demonetization of silver; that the work of measuring the values of the world has thus been thrown upon gold; that there is not enough gold to perform this work, and that the consequence is, that the yardstick of values has been lengthened and producers have to give more of their products to get a dollar (in gold) than when the nations generally used both gold and silver to measure their values.

There is undoubtedly some truth in this, but it cannot be remedied by the United States alone, and, as previously stated, there is a far more potent reason why prices are low.

The facilities of production and distribution have been so increased that the supply has outrun the demand (the capacity to consume) in nearly all the numerous articles which enter into human consumption.

Steam, electricity and machinery are the powers which now rule the world.

The exchanges of the world are principally made by credit, and credit is now *telegraphed* to the uttermost parts of the earth. Checks and notes and bills of exchange (evidences of credit) do most of the business of the world, and coin comes in as the foundation upon which the great structure is based.

While over-production in the products of the soil depends in great measure upon the seasons, yet machinery for cultivation and harvesting is a great factor, and for distribution it is all-controlling.

If a scarcity prevails in any part of the world the news is flashed to some region of plenty, and steam hurries supplies to where the want exists. Steam is our genie and electricity our slave of the ring. They not only tend to constantly lower values, but to bring them to a common level throughout the world.

Tariffs and trusts may here and there temporarily obstruct, but the great movement towards over-production and lower values goes on and will go on until the consumers' day of millennium arrives.

Never before has the consumer been able to buy so many comforts for a dollar as now. Never before has the average laborer been able to exchange a day's labor for so much as now, and this in the face of the great competition he sustains from machinery. He has learned to organize and to demand a larger share in the profits of production, and now machinery serves him, indirectly if not directly.

Only those manufacturers who possess a monopoly through

patents, or by such an extensive combination as to enable them to control the supply for a time, can command good profits, and these only for a limited time.

Capital is so universal and plentiful that opportunities for its remunerative employment are eagerly sought. The price for its use, or, in other words, its margin of profit, is also steadily diminishing, and combinations often find that they have not succeeded in eliminating competition, but have only lifted it to a higher plane where it works more intensely, and that they have caused the duplication of machinery and manufacturing plants to an extent far beyond the ability of the market to absorb their product, with the result of again lowering prices to a point never before attained.

The average manufacturer who is not in any combination finds much the same state of things—too many goods, too small profits—hence, the constant tendency towards combination, in the hope of maintaining remunerative profits.

It is safe to say that, generally speaking, these hopes will not be realized. The forces opposed to them are too strong and too universal to be overcome. The tendency of prices can only be downward, and it will probably level up humanity, for as comfort increases, the human animal improves.

This is proven by the speedy evolution of the impoverished of all nations who come to our shores. Our educational, social and political system is doubtless entitled to some of the credit for this, but good living is essential to good thinking, and prosperity for the masses is essential to the greatness and prosperity of the nation.

All true Americans believe that it is the destiny of the United States to lead the nations in the march of progress under the influence of the great forces which are urging the world forward, and if while wealth accumulates men do not decay, nothing can be more certain.

We are fortunate in having in the pending Presidential election two good candidates. Both are experienced and honest, and the material interests of the country will be safe in the care of either. Each, in ability and patriotism, is above the average of his party, and appreciates that

> "Not he that breaks the dams,
> But he that through the channels of the State
> Convoys the people's wish, is great:
> His name is pure, his fame is free."

It is probable that the campaign will be less heated and less acrimonious than usual, and when it is over it will be found that in this instance, at least, a full average year's business has been done, notwithstanding the Presidential election.

As to the differing policies of the two principal parties affecting business interests, they are not likely to differ as much in performance as they do in the promises of a political campaign.

The silver question will receive reasonable and conservative treatment at the hands of either candidate.

The Democratic party is too wise to break down existing industries that have developed under a protective tariff, although they may modify the tariff law when the protective principle has been carried to unreasonable extremes.

The Republicans, if they suceeed, will not again attempt the folly of the Force Bill.

The Democrat who denounces the policy of building up an American merchant marine, which supports itself in time of peace and furnishes a militia of the seas in time of war, is an enemy alike to his country and his party.

The spectacle of statesmen voting enormous sums for a navy that is non-self-supporting, and refusing comparatively petty amounts for mail service in American ships which perform a real service in carrying both our mails and our products, besides forming a naval militia, is too absurd to long exist.

Neither side dare go much farther in taxing the labor of the country for pensions which are already more lavish than the world has ever seen. There is reason in all things: and the people are becoming weary of the repeated demands upon them for pensions, organized by claim agents who care for nothing but their own exorbitant commissions.

The business men of the country should make their voices heard upon these main questions of policy, no matter which party wins, so that radical and unwise action from any source may be discouraged.

F. B. THURBER.

A LAST WORD ON LONDON SOCIETY.

BY LADY FRANCES BALFOUR.

If London society exhibits all the symptoms of an effete civilization, as Lady Jeune assures us that it does in the article which appeared in the May number of this Review, she at least has had the courage and audacity to cry woe against it. London cannot say it was left in ignorance of its doom.

"Luxury, ease, and comfort," cries Lady Jeune, "are undermining our society as surely and as certainly as they did that of ancient Rome." It must be supposed that in writing her jeremiad for the instruction and benefit of the American public, Lady Jeune has felt sternly compelled to wash her dirty linen before a younger and therefore purer society, and that she feels convinced that this modern type of "ancient Rome" can only be cleansed of its iniquity by the incursion of "a horde of barbarians," who will extirpate the worn-out and effeminate Londoners, and fill with fresh and vigorous life the sluggish and impure pulse of society. This is the most charitable construction it is possible to put on the attack Lady Jeune has made on the society life of her own countrymen, and the exposition of what she believes to be their vices, before the eyes of another world.

If she was desirous of crossing the sea there is nothing to complain of in the direction she has chosen, and if the criticism she invites is to come from any society, we would as soon have it from America as from elsewhere. The Americans' relationship to ourselves will make them careful how they "throw stones at those who live in glass houses." They know how many of their women they have sent to wallow in this sink of iniquity, and they will give anxious heed to the railing accusations brought against the society in which they now take so conspicuous a part;

and, further, no country will be less inclined to be influenced in its judgment by mere cant and Pharisaical morality than the audience to which Lady Jeune appeals.

Lady Jeune in her painting uses a large canvas, her assertions are drawn in such bold and sweeping lines, her colors are so coarse, her subject is so glaringly unlike nature, and her execution is so masterly in its technique, that it is permissible to admire for a minute before turning to the duty of contradicting these assertions, toning down these colors, representing the subject as it really exists, and varnishing the whole with a thin coating of accuracy.

In one respect it will be impossible to follow Lady Jeune's example; that is, in her comments on the throne, and on "the acknowledged leader of society." It has always been held ungenerous to attack those who from their position are unable to defend, or answer for, themselves, and it is not according to any of the established rules of courtesy, let alone loyalty—a word somewhat rusted by disuse, but to be found in Webster's Dictionary—to discuss those who rule over us. The Queen has not "abdicated her position as head of society." The influence her presence exercises on it to-day is as great, though differing in kind, as it was in the days of her early court. It is true that the circumstances which have made "the crown a lonely splendor" have tended to the seclusion of the Queen, and, therefore, during the last thirty years her court has not often, or for any great length of time, been held in London. But Lady Jeune is mistaken if she thinks that the Queen has "abdicated her position as head of society" because it has pleased her to appear less frequently in its midst. Presentations at court are necessary for formal admittance into society, and everyone knows that the Queen superintends these presentations closely, so that those who are not fit persons to be presented at court can gain no social recognition. But beyond these laws which rule the etiquette of the sovereign's court, it is perfectly well known that the Queen is well informed of all that passes in society, and when a necessity arises her opinion on the matter is made known.

Those who believe nothing is effective if it is not done with noise and personal prominence, can form no conception of what an influence the sovereign has upon the lives of her subjects. For they know that whether she appears among them or not, she

has a constant and unselfish thought for their social as well as political welfare. They have before them the long history of her reign, bright with the example of a consistent and revered life.

> "She wrought her people lasting good;
> Her court was pure; her life serene."

And they know there can be no "abdication," for the rule is rooted in the hearts and consciences of society.

Lady Jeune has had to experience the fate of a prophet without honor in her own country. No class of London society since the publication of her article has robed itself in sackcloth and bewailed its sins, or offered to avert the impending doom by amending its ways. "Impenitent peoples" the prophets have always found, but in one case a true prophet was comforted with the assurance that there were yet seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. If it is of any comfort to Lady Jeune to know that a similar proportion of London society cannot honestly charge themselves or their "set" or "section," however "small" or "large," "smart" or "dull," with any ambitious attempt to copy the corruption of "ancient Rome;" who feel that such lurid types as are depicted in these pages are strangers to them; and who experience complete surprise in learning that the society in which they thought they moved with a good deal of innocent enjoyment to themselves and their surroundings is so full of corruption and of the worship of Mammon, then it is possible to administer that consolation. The truth is that Lady Jeune, like many reformers, has allowed her mind to dwell so exclusively on the blots and sores from which unfortunately no large society has ever been free that she has lost all sense of proportion, and has taken the life of a few individuals, as indicative of the tone of the whole mass of society.

"Money is the idol of the day," and to prove this assertion Lady Jeune describes the extravagant bids which are made by those, who, having no birthright to social position, struggle to gain a footing therein by means which perhaps do not tend greatly to the dignity of those who use them, but which it seems rather uncharitable to call wrong. It is perfectly true that people "who desire to know every one, and to go everywhere," accomplish this desire, at the cost of a good deal of personal exertion and self-advertisement. They do entertain at great cost and with great display,

and their hospitality is enjoyed by people who, it is undoubtedly true, would have had no opportunity of knowing of the existence of their hosts had it not been for the wealth which has enabled those hosts to entertain "society." These gorgeous entertainments can only be given by the few, and they have introduced a deplorably elaborate scale of entertaining. But Lady Jeune in describing this ornate expenditure expressly says it is the characteristic of "the smartest people." Now "smartness" has nothing to do with good society. People in good society may, among other qualities, have whatever is implied in this word, but "smartness" alone, without those gifts of refinement and culture, which with good breeding are the heritage of good birth, ranks for nothing. Ease and intimacy are the distinguishing marks of this social life, and neither the wealth nor the rank of this circle is of importance, so long as they possess these gifts. Those who have merely wealth to offer can never be of it, and though the portal is open to all, only such as are fitted by their qualities become one with all that is best and most agreeable in its inner life.

Lady Jeune dates the "change" over the face of matters social from the time of the Reform Bill of 1832. That unfortunate measure has had to bear the burden of many sins laid at its door, but we learn for the first time from Lady Jeune that while society was purely political, it was freer from the moral corruptions of ancient Rome. Lady Jeune seems to fear that "the antagonistic elements" are at this time too bitter to be brought together.

It is to be hoped that party spirit may wax and grow, if its wane implies that "political society as such" is again to exist. The whole social fabric would fall to pieces were so severe a remedy to be applied to its diseases. It is but giving the Houses of Parliament their due to assert that if their members are not brought together by themselves within the "four walls," on which Lady Jeune discourses with such eloquence, it is more from a sense that dulness will reign supreme than that the blasts of political rancor will shatter the four walls which inclose them.

The young men and maidens do not escape Lady Jeune's severe censure. The *jeunesse dorée* prefers the supper room to dancing. A member of this class is represented as surveying rows of damsels, anxious to dance, and mothers equally anxious to see them so employed, with an eye-glass full of scorn, and he

adds to the sins of eating too much, and dancing too little, the further iniquity of remaining a bachelor. He certainly had better "ca' canny," if the damsels from whom he is to choose a wife in the least degree resemble the people here described. They differ from their grandmothers. (In all ages, grandmothers have complained of this departure from precedent.) They read newspapers, and discuss novels and the last scandal. They drive alone in hansoms, and they ride in the park unattended by grooms. Lady Jeune hints darkly that this results in an expedition to Gretna Green. An American critic of London manners observed that it seemed to him that "the girls were employed in driving their grooms about in small carts." Critics and prophetesses are alike hard to please in these days! When Lady Jeune has asserted the young woman's preference for "leafy corners" in the ball room, and her love for getting into debt with her dressmaker, she has concluded her charge.

The changes in manners and decorous customs, during the last two centuries, are a study in themselves. Many articles might be written describing them. Within living memory it was inexpedient for a gentlewoman to walk in the streets of London, without the protection of a footman, and it was not "genteel" behavior to use any form of "hackney coach."

Friendships between the sexes were guarded and trammelled in a like manner, with a thousand restrictions. These have been "released," and Lady Jeune says the logical result of the change in manners is shown in "recent scandals." If there had been no scandals when these restraints were most stringently enforced there is no doubt the relaxations of restraint ought to be much regretted, and an effort should be made to reinstate them. But the evidence of contemporary memoirs and biographies tells a different tale. These protections and limitations were necessary, because society was less civilized and humane than it is at this day. To walk escorted in such a way would now only attract attention, instead of affording protection. The streets are safe to well-conducted people, because society has recognized the right of the weak to a chivalrous protection from the whole public. The change in the social life between the sexes is based on the same grounds. Undoubtedly it has its dangers; there were those who, whatever precautions were taken to insure their safety, managed to ruin their lives, and in these days there are those who make liberty a cloak for

license. But it is not a decaying society which finds that for the most part greater reliance may be placed than was placed of old on the honor and chivalry of men, and believes that women can be trusted to care for their own honor, and can learn to make themselves independent, because their right to independence is respected.

Few people will agree with Lady Jeune's pessimistic view of the young girls of the present day. Their education is one fitted to make them capable both in mind and body. To assert that in "their lives there is no question of aught but pleasure" is singularly far from being the truth. To very few of them would the reproach of "Lady Clara Vere de Vere" be applicable. There is no truer sign of the fruits of Christianity in our century than the efforts which are made by the younger generation to give some portion of "their good things" to the darkened and impoverished life of London, and to care for the people who live at the gates of their country homes. Some of the greatest owners of wealth in our country, and not always men of one nation and kindred, have made their vast country estates centres of wise and benevolent thought for the people.

If there is a "pleasure-loving" spirit abroad in the land, it is a spirit which endeavors to make the greater number enjoy some tastes from their fountains of delight. No one has been a more active pioneer in many forms of good works than Lady Jeune herself. Her name is known as the cheerer of the lives of the little ones of London, and she has had many opportunities of knowing how ready are the purses, and how generous has been the help of every kind, which has come to her aid in these good works, and the majority of girls in English society spend some hours a week in kindred efforts. Lady Jeune takes great exception to the unexclusive character of English society. She groans over its democratic tendencies. She thinks the evil serious, when wealth and *notoriety* gain people admission to society, and she adjures the "shades of Almack's to turn in their graves," and bids them know that their "children and grandchildren are associating on terms of intimacy and equality with a crowd whose sole recommendation is, that it panders and ministers to the most demoralizing influences of an age already bad enough." It is to be hoped that "the shades" are better employed, and if they are studying the question at all attentively, they probably have ar-

rived at the conclusion that it is not worth while to turn in their graves over the doings of a "very small set."

Lady Jeune writes as if every social meeting represented Madame Tussaud's celebrities, including the Chamber of Horrors, and as if Mrs. Leo Hunter was the hostess in every house, and her drawing-rooms were haunted by the heroes and heroines of the last *cause célèbre*, surrounded by their legal assistants.

Lion hunting exists, and the Mrs. Leo Hunters feed the lions "till they roar," but it is absurd to say that lion-hunting encourages vice. The houses where these "variety entertainments" take place are rather to be avoided on the ground that in them with more certainty than anywhere else will be found all the distinguished bores. The most "pleasure loving" peoples have never been able wholly to eradicate this element from social life.

It has been impossible to treat seriously a description of our social life, written in a vein so intemperate and exaggerated, but there are two charges brought against society by Lady Jeune which, if proved, would indeed point to the decay of our whole national life. She makes the gravest accusations against the young married women, the mothers of the rising generation, and she does not hesitate to press home these charges in language as unbridled as the license and immorality of which she accuses them.

If it were true that "strong religious belief" is decaying, in any section of society, Lady Jeune would be justified in thinking the decline of morals as serious as she asserts it to be. But here again Lady Jeune is led away by the noisy few, and she is rendered incapable of appreciating the whole truth. If there are fewer restraints for those who sin against the moral law, there is also a greater liberty given to the fool to speak his thoughts on religious matters, and yet at no period of the Christian era has the sway of religion had more effect on the moral lives of the community.

The existence of a decay of religious faith is not to be judged by those who clamor against its doctrines and do not practise its faith. The standard-bearers of the cross are many, and they are to be found in every section and class. The Pharisee and the superficial observer may overlook such people, for their faith is shown forth in their works of love and charitable intercourse with their neighbors. They are in the world, but their un-

spotted garments proclaim that they are not of the world, and while they give society the salt and savor of their presence, there need be no gloomy prognostications of society's decay.

One question must be asked after reading such a paper as that with which we are dealing. Do "these denunciations and militant mongerings of moral half-truths" tend to the purification of society? Does the society aimed at benefit by this casting of stones? Is the sewer cleansed by calling aloud that it is foul? The follies and vices of any community will always strike the eye, for they are "naked and unashamed," but its purification will be wrought out by individual example, and by individual effort to maintain the highest ideal.

FRANCES BALFOUR.

TWO CONGRESSES CONTRASTED.

BY EX-SPEAKER REED.

WHENEVER an army is like the famous army of Xerxes, essentially barbaric, it matters not how far the ranks stretch across the field of vision, or how far off on the horizon's edge they pass glittering out of sight. They are useless alike for conquest or for slaughter. The numbers only emphasize the failure. They hasten its downfall, and serve only to astonish children in story books that so many could be conquered by so few. Wherever discipline or unity of purpose is lacking, numbers may be one of the elements of disaster. No army can fight the enemy if it must at the same time fight itself.

When the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress met, it met as a mob, and has kept up that interesting form of organization ever since. Of course, the Republican leaders could have driven the enemy into compact shape, covered them with reproaches, forced them to train, and otherwise have made an army of them. Then there would have been much glory won by the said leaders among the unthinking, but the exhibition would have been lost to the world of Democracy, as it really is a hopeless assortment of discordant differences, as incapable of positive action as it is capable of infinite clamor.

As the American people are about to enter upon the great Presidential struggle of 1892, in which is involved not merely the Chief Magistrate of the country and his possible successor, not merely the Senate and House of Representatives, but all the legislation and the progress of the United States for at least four years, it may be well to see what has been the result of a Democratic House, powerful beyond any in our history, capable of overwhelming their opponents by the terrible vote of three to one. Surely such a House ought to have been an example of

what an ideal Democratic House would be, for they had only to settle within the bosom of their own party what they would do, and their vast majority enabled them to act without the slightest heed to the small minority the people had seen fit to send to represent the principles which at the last Presidential election had been in pitched battle victorious over all. With such a majority we had a right to expect some display of those principles which enable a man to say "I am a Democrat," and still think himself decent. But if we did entertain such expectations they have all vanished, and in the heat of the summer sun we watch the perspiring Democratic patriot engaged in the only work his House of Representatives has ever undertaken, the work of trying to find a day of adjournment, which, when it comes, will again land him on the stump with principles to let suitable to each locality, and hampered by no deed done or policy established; the same old Democratic maverick never branded until the day of sale and not even then indelibly.

When the House met, we all naturally expected that the man who represented the latest phase of Democracy,—which is called "Tariff Reform" by the judicious and "Free Trade" by the courageous,—Mr. Mills, the Representative from Texas, then supposed to be the embodiment of Democracy, would be chosen to represent the party of which he had been the mouthpiece for years. But the tendency of Democracy towards chaos was irresistible. The determination of the leaders that the party should enter the next contest unencumbered by principles pushed Mr. Mills to the wall, and gave the place to Mr. Crisp, of Georgia, whose superiority over Mr. Mills in evenness of temper has not been so marked as we had all hoped.

The rest of the organization was made in furtherance of this plan of non-committalism. Mr. Springer was placed at the head of the Committee of Ways and Means instead of Mr. Mills, who, by all usage, was entitled to it, and to whom it could not have been refused unless the party had come to a determination to announce a change of policy from straightforward tariff reform, a remedy as broad as the alleged disease, to a piecemeal work which would declare no policy and leave the future to everybody's hopes. Mr. Springer was, under these circumstances, very appropriately placed at the head of the committee. While Mr. Springer has at all times formed and expressed a great variety of opinions on a

great variety of subjects, he has never been by his friends or his enemies regarded as in the least degree bigoted. History has justfiied the confidence which the Democracy have in Mr. Springer. He has been a Democrat. The party can contemplate his work of this session with the calm certainty that there is no intellect so subtle, no mind so broad, no sympathy so delicate, as to detect therein the slightest trace of a principle of economic science or a system of revenue ; and the Democracy certainly do enter the next campaign unembarrassed by their immediate past, and with great power of being natural, that is, of being all things to all men.

All this is, undoubtedly, shrewd political management, but at the expense of all that is manly, open, and fair. Mr. Mills and Mr. Carlisle managed far otherwise. They laid before the people of the United States their example of tariff reform and manfully hung out their ensign, and did open and generous battle. If they were conquered, they at least knew that the people did their work with eyes open, knowing what they did. Tariff reform may mean all sorts of things. Under the leadership of Mills and Carlisle the Democracy proclaimed what they meant. The Democracy of this Congress, under Mr. Springer, have been trying in all ways to keep from the people what they mean, and propose to fight the next battle without any flag and from an ambuscade.

The Democracy in the House, with a force of three to one, have not only done nothing with the tariff, but they have done nothing with anything else ; not only have they done nothing, but at the very beginning they deliberately established a system of rules which made it a foregone conclusion that not only had the leaders abdicated, but they were determined that nobody else should reign. Given a wonderful power by the people, a power which might have enabled them to carry out any plan for the relief of what they called the down-trodden people, they deliberately put the veto into the hands of one-third, and in most cases into the hands of less, and relapsed into imbecility. Not one measure above the dignity of rye straw will mark the annals of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress. In history it will present all the dead level of a Dutch landscape with all its windmills, but without a trace of its beauty and fertility. The only picturesque object which will break the sky line will be Mr. Holman draped as a statue of Economy, standing on the railroad-crowned

summit of the Lawrenceburg embankment trying in vain with a spy-glass to find any trace of the river the embankment was intended to confine. Indiana, however, and the appropriation will be in full view.

When this House met great hopes were entertained that strict economy would reign. The man whose reputation was the highest was placed at the head of the Committee on Appropriations, and the great duty of reducing to an honest level all the expenditures of the government was entered upon. Mr. Holman, the great high priest of the new dispensation, disappeared from mortal view for many days, and finally reappeared with a calm, stately, and beautiful self-denying resolution proclaiming the principles of honesty, just as though they had been newly discovered, and were, for the first time in the history of the world, to be put into practice. It was a solemn moment. Everybody felt that the high-water mark of human virtue had been reached, and, under the awe-inspiring impressions of that day, they were treated as scoffers who suggested that after high water came the ebb. I hate to tell the sequel; but, alas, the scoffers were right. Never since that hour have the Democracy looked so grand, gloomy, and peculiar as on that Pentecostal day when the Holman proclamation of economic virtue was administered to them, and they resolved how bad others had been, and how good they themselves would be. It is sad to be obliged to add that now, after the results have been reached, we find that the squandering Republicans appropriated 463 millions at the first session of the "Billion Congress," while the economic Democrats have appropriated over 500 millions at the first session of a Congress that certainly can never be called a "Nickel Congress." Would it be in the nature of insult to the fallen to propose to the Honorable Mr. Holman of Indiana a sum in the rule of three? If the expenditure of 463 millions made us of the Fifty-first Congress "rascals," what precise epithet would do justice to those who have appropriated 500 millions? It really begins to look as if this country was too big to be measured in some half-bushels.

There have been two reports of the Committee on Elections, one in favor of the Democrat and the other in favor of the Republican. The House indorsed and sustained its committee in unseating the Republican, while it rose above party, voted down

its own partizan committee and kept in its place Democratic Mr. Rockwell, probably believing that the declaration "I am a Democrat" is in the United States, as it is in New York, a better certificate of election than the votes of the people.

On this action of the House, deliberately and for partisan purposes overruling the deliberate judgment of its own committee, and seating the Democrat without even a vestige of right, by sheer force of numbers, there has been no comment by Democratic newspapers and very little by our own. Had such an outrage been possible in a House Republican three to one, the air would have been burdened with outcries from March to the day of the election. Whenever the Democracy steal a seat in Congress or even a State nobody minds it. It is no use to talk about it. It is like saying a fish swims, or a horse runs, or a cat likes cream. It must be a tremendous rest to be a Democrat.

Contrast with this picture of a House overwhelmingly Democratic a picture, the truthfulness of which no man can dispute, of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress, and mark the surprising difference. When that House was adjourned, amid defeat and disaster, I ventured the assertion that the day would come when every man who belonged to the majority, and not a few of the minority, would be proud to have belonged to that goodly company. I confess that I thought of a very distant day after many years of fight and storm and stress. But two years only have elapsed. Not only have Democratic outcries ceased and Democratic clamor subsided, but the best men even of that party are looking forward to the reëstablishment of the rules of that House as the sound basis of business action in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. It would seem as if the time had come for a candid review of the years 1890 and 1891.

The first duty of any legislative body is to examine its own membership, to unseat those wrongfully present, and to seat those whom the people have chosen. This duty is of the very essence of free government. In the Fifty-first Congress the Committee on Elections, composed of men of irreproachable character on the one side as well as the other, made seventeen reports, of which nine were in favor of Republicans, seven in favor of Democrats, and one in favor of a Democrat who was chosen by the Farmers' Alliance. In the cases which were reached the House sustained the Committee and passed upon thirteen cases. Four

cases, those of two Republicans and two Democrats, were not passed upon. These figures themselves, on the face of them, show a fairness and justice which the examination of each case in detail will entirely justify. The results of this committee's action can safely challenge comparison with that of any committee since the first Congress convened.

When the Congress met its plain duty after determining its membership was to legislate. Affairs had been approaching a crisis ever since the last Republican Congress adjourned in 1883; public business of the most urgent kind had so accumulated and so pressed upon the government that it absolutely had to be transacted. There were great public questions upon which there could no longer be refused a decision. A rapidly-growing surplus was not only disarranging our finances, but was inviting, with irresistible power, large and constantly increasing expenditures. In order to increase the leverage of this surplus the Democrats had refused to pay the honest debts of the country, and, although a majority of themselves were in favor of it, had refused to refund the direct tax paid by the loyal States and refused by the disloyal South. The tariff demanded revision; international copyright demanded adjustment; our merchant marine demanded encouragement; and the people demanded relief from over-taxation on items which, like sugar, could not be produced here in full supply, and on which all that was paid was a mere tax paid without any hope of that ulterior benefit which comes from the protection of an industry which can fully supply all wants.

The World's Fair had to be arranged for. Oklahoma needed to be made a Territory and placed under safe and salutary laws. Wyoming and Idaho were pressing to be admitted as States. A new Congressional Apportionment Act had to be passed. The land laws needed revising. The State Agricultural colleges needed to to be placed on a better basis. In the interest of our export trade meat and cattle inspection required immediate attention. The silver question, owing to the neglect of our financiers, and the strenuous exertions of the friends of free coinage, had assumed such an importance in the eyes of the people that it was no longer in the power of the Congress to refuse action. The decision of the Supreme Court as to the original-package question had so interfered with local self-government that the States had to be reclothed with power to control their affairs. Indian reservations

needed to be opened. Indian debts and French spoliation claims, both shamefully neglected, needed to be paid, and the action of the Maritime Conference demanded ratification. The great questions of service and disability pensions could no longer be neglected, and had to be fully and satisfactorily discussed and treated. Measures had also to be taken to suppress the Louisiana Lottery—legislation which was called for against an institution established under the constitution of a Democratic State, but which spread its baleful influences over the whole Union, and had to be dealt with by Federal law.

There were many smaller matters important for each locality, and for that locality just as important as the great national questions to which I have referred. This accumulation of business had been the result of a series of Democratic Houses from 1883 to 1889. The business of eight years had to be done in two. The three Democratic Houses which preceded us were as inefficient as our successor. No sooner was the House called to order than it became clear to any man of sense that the first question was not what business should be done, but whether any business should be done at all.

The Democracy were very confident. For fifty years they and their kind had been building up against the will of the people barriers so complicated, so diverse, so numerous, and so closely interwoven with the prejudices and customs of many generations that the Citadel of Do Nothing seemed unapproachable from sea or shore. The veto power of the minority, enhanced at every opportunity by the decisions of Democratic Speakers, was something of which the nation had no conception, and such as was never tolerated in any other legislative body. Obstructions of the will of the people had even become the plaything of any angry hour.

Unless the House could be emancipated from the bad traditions of fifty years there was no hope of legislation, and all the fierce contests by which a Republican President had been elected and a Republican House had been installed would have been fought in vain. But fortunately for the country the House was strong enough to meet its duties, and, amid shouts and outcries which already seem strange and incomprehensible, broke down the barriers of custom and reëstablished the right of the majority to rule. This was its greatest achievement, for which it will have a name in history.

Having thus assumed the reins of power, the majority became responsible for what was done. They became responsible for the Act of 1890 relating to the purchase of silver. Whether that act, isolated from all the circumstances of 1890, was absolutely wise is more than I know. That it then and there saved this country from the free coinage for which every Democratic leader was then clamoring, and on which they are now so silent, I do know. If time shall show that it ought to be repealed, that will in no wise militate against the wisdom of passing it in 1890. They became responsible for the refunding of the direct tax, a just measure, which, among other things, saved from bankruptcy the State of Kentucky, most, if not all, of whose Representatives voted against it.

They became responsible for that latest revision of the tariff, which is just now rising so high above the slanders which two years ago poured upon it as if the foundation of the great deep had been broken up. Free sugar, larger exports and larger imports are fully justifying the bill, and increased manufacturing results will soon add their quota to the returning prosperity of the country.

They became responsible also for the meat and cattle inspection, which took away from foreign nations their last excuse for refusing to receive our food products, and enabled our able Secretary of Agriculture and our foreign ministers to restore to us in some measure the markets of the world for such products.

They became responsible for the destruction of the Louisiana Lottery. They redeemed the honor of the United States by making provision to pay its honest debts. They opened up to actual settlement many million acres of productive lands, and gave a suitable form of government to vast areas of the territory of the United States.

They became responsible for pension laws which the Democratic House has not dared to assail, and which, however much they may be covertly complained of, were but the assurance of the nation that the soldiers of the war and their dependents might be forever sure that the bounty of the nation, which it was honorable for them to receive, should stand between them and that taint of dishonor which, whether justly or unjustly, has always attached itself to local and parochial charity.

But it is not necessary to again enumerate the acts passed

by the Fifty-first Congress. The catalogue already given of duties pressing upon the Congress at its commencement is also a catalogue of duties done. The House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress met every responsibility without exception, and gave the judgment of the representatives of the people upon all the questions which the people put before them.

That all this work was accomplished at any time under most favorable circumstances would have been a great achievement, but that it was accomplished, and so well accomplished, under the fiercest opposition that ever existed in any legislative body, is a tribute alike to the soundness of the rules of the House and the unfaltering courage of its majority. After the lapse of only two years the fierce fire of reproach and clamor has all died away, and out of the mouths of its most strenuous opponents its praises are perfected.

The Supreme Court of the United States has followed the judgment of every other tribunal that ever passed upon the question, and pronounced with the same unanimity which characterized the others that a "present quorum" is the only quorum contemplated by the Constitution of the United States. No fatuous action of any majority, however large or however foolish, can ever again be shielded by any claim of the lack of power. The right of the majority to rule has been established as our fathers understood it, and can never again be abdicated. If autocratic power is again given to minorities, the majority cannot escape responsibility. It is true that the present House has refused its privileges, and shirked its duties, and led a gelatinous life, to the scorn of all vertebrate animals; nevertheless the example once set of a House of Representatives doing all the work put before it, and emerging in two short years from a deluge of reproach, with its actions justified by events and its method of action justified by the highest tribunal known to our law, can never be lost to the future of this country.

With the single exception of the tariff act, which is the subject of partisan attack, every act passed by the Fifty-first Congress has remained unassailed by even a Democratic House, and the long list of acts which though done in two years, were really the business of more than eight years, now stand, with a single exception, approved by the silence of an opposition which was wildly and rampantly vociferous when these acts were passed.

Look over the list of legislative acts for 1890 and 1891. Compare them in intrinsic importance with those passed by any Congress of the century, and you will find no rival list except that enacted by the first Congress of the war, when considerations taking hold of the very existence of the nation had silenced opposition, and left patriotism unobstructed.

Our reputation, the reputation of the Fifty-first Congress, for wisdom has been vindicated by the permanence of our laws. Our reputation for the economical appropriation of the public funds in the interest of the people has been more than vindicated by the appropriation of 40 millions in addition to what we expended—an appropriation made by the very boasters who reviled us so triumphantly while they were putting on the harness. Mr. Holman now understands as never before the wisdom of that scripture, which says: "Let not him that putteth on the harness boast like him that putteth it off."

Surely the verdict of history, the only verdict worth having, is doubly delightful when it comes thus swiftly and to living men.

THOMAS B. REED.

PARTY CONVENTIONS.

BY SENATOR JOHN T. MORGAN, OF ALABAMA.

NOMINATIONS of candidates for President and Vice-President have been made, platforms have been formulated and prescribed to the people and to Congress, and nothing remains but for the four hundred and forty-four electors of the States to record as mere puppets the edict of the conventions. In casting their electoral votes in their respective States they must carry into effect this record prepared for them. If they should refuse to do so for any reason of their own, however just and important, it would be at the peril of infamy and even of suffering death by mob law. No crime, old or new, well known or newly discovered, perpetrated by the man whom they are required to vote for, would release the electors from the obligation imposed upon them by the national convention to which they hold a party allegiance. When this statement of facts and conditions, which is true and exact, is compared with the constitution of our country and with the duties and powers of the great office of elector, created by that instrument and existing in no other form of government, it is startling to contemplate the prostrate condition into which the whole system of constitutional elections of President and Vice-President has fallen. The politicians, in their eager hunt for power, have, as they think, utterly effaced those features of the constitution that were intended to maintain and preserve the sovereignty of the States in creating, by their separate and independent action, Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the United States.

These conventions virtually create electors for the several States, through agencies that are subordinate to their own power, over whose election, qualification, and returns they have usurped what is now unquestioned and final authority. The electors to

be voted for in the States, under the national convention system, must be regularly chosen by the factions that are represented in the conventions by their recognized delegates. No man could be less independent, or more a slave to superior power, than an elector chosen by a political party to represent a State and, yet, to record the decrees of a national convention.

Concede, for argument's sake, that a national convention could be a safe place for selecting, instructing, and binding electors to do the will of their masters—the men who grind them out, like sausages, from their political machines—yet the question recurs, What have the Territories to do with selecting, instructing, and binding the electors to be "appointed" by "each State, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct"?

This arangement gotten up by the office-seekers, for their own advantage, under the pretence of widening the basis of representation in the national conventions in order to give greater freedom and breadth to the expression of the popular will, is a total perversion and a serious abuse of the rights of the States to appoint their own electors and to instruct them, if they need instructions, as to the persons for whom they should vote. The only feature of the Federal Government in which the States, acting as such and in virtue of their local sovereignty, are recognized as being entirely independent, is in respect of the appointment of electors to vote for President and Vice-President of the United States. No federal authority can directly control the States in this matter. Yet these national conventions, because they assume to speak the will of the people, indirectly control the appointment of electors as completely as if they were possessed of the sovereign power to rule the States.

The subject of the appointment of electors was twice carefully considered: First, in 1787, and again in 1804, when the XIIth amendment to the constitution was adopted. There was no haste in these counsels, or want of serious attention to this vital and peculiar feature of our government. When it was provided in the original constitution, and was left undisturbed in the XIIth amendment, that "each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of Electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or

profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector," principles were then established that are inviolable.

If a national convention, composed largely of members of Congress, of persons holding offices of trust or profit under the United States, and of delegates from Territories, can ratify, in advance of election, or can refuse to ratify, and thereby defeat, the appointment of electors chosen by the States respectively, they can, by such conduct, select their tools and minions to exercise the powers of electors and abrogate the independence of the States.

It is not a sufficient answer to this sort of war upon State independence, that each State may still appoint its electors, independently of the decree of the convention. Such is not the truth of history, nor will it ever be while national conventions control the political action of the people in the States. The conventions meet in advance of the appointment of the electors and resolve upon the nominees for President and Vice-President and, literally, confine the power of the electors to the casting of their votes for the men who are thus supposed to receive a majority of the votes cast in their respective States or districts.

The combination of the entire political power of every State and Territory is centred upon the men named by the conventions respectively, and through the election of them ruin may come to the people of any State. They must endure the wrong and submit without a murmur, so omnipotent is this concentrated national power. The men holding offices of trust or profit under the United States, and the men affiliated with these politically and holding seats in Congress by the same party tenure, and those who are seeking such places alone through party fealty, are too numerous and too powerful for any State or even many States to withstand. Such States are given to understand that the dominant power in the conventions will be the dominant power in Congress, as the one great party or the other may triumph in the elections, and that their only safety, their only chance for equality of statehood and for fair treatment, is in submission to the will of the great national conventions.

Members of Congress and officeholders leave their seats and posts of duty and unite their great power with that of expectant people in other States and Territories who are inflamed

by party zeal, or are hungering for the offices, and thus, through the decrees of the conventions, they endeavor to accomplish what they have not the power to do in their respective chambers, in fair debate and with responsible votes. This union of illegitimate forces is replete with mischief, malodorous with scandal, and violates that wise and careful provision of the constitution under which the day on which the electors shall give their votes is required to be the same throughout the United States.

There could be but one reason for this provision of the constitution (and it is historic), that the electors in each State should be so independent of all the others that there should be no opportunity for trades and combinations between them, or for the pressure of outside influence upon them. Our national conventions have so far obliterated this part of the constitution that selfish combinations have become the prevailing factors in all nominations for President and Vice-President. The electors are really "appointed" on the day that the nominations for President and Vice-President are made by the conventions. These candidates for President and Vice-President, if they have the popular strength, really appoint their electors, who have no discretion in respect of the votes they will cast. They must vote for the nominees. The convention nominees are thus invested with the power of absolute political dictation. The platforms on which they are made to pose by the conventions do not even bind them in conscience, and are neglected, or perverted, or glozed over, to suit the personal views of the candidate as to the best method of securing the suffrages of the people. In the destruction of the rightful power, dignity, and responsibility of the great office of Presidential elector, so essential to the liberties of the people, to the self-government of the States, and to the peace of the country when military dictators shall arise to claim the sceptre of power, we have sacrificed both the form and the substance of constitutional elections of President and Vice-President, and we only gain the opportunity of filling the offices of the country, from President to tide-waiter, under the decrees of one or the other of the great national conventions.

We also tolerate these conventions in their assumed authority of prescribing to Congress the measures of legislation which they choose to outline as the true expression of the popular will. This transfer of the legislative authority to these conventions would,

possibly, ruin the country in a single campaign were it not that the party platforms are so loosely drawn up in order to entrap votes that the conscience of the legislators is left somewhat free in its construction of the commands of superior authority. If the platforms were sincere and were expressed in honest, plain terms, Congress would have nothing to do but to record in its statute books what the conventions have enacted. But the platforms are known to be worthless, except as the basis of campaign argument. The platforms are formulated with the sole purpose of getting the largest possible number of votes for the nominees—the offices being the beginning and the end, and the sole purpose of the manipulators of the national conventions.

The use of money, in vast sums, has become essential as an element of success in Presidential elections, just as coal is an essential in the propulsion of a steamer across the Atlantic. The conventions, therefore, carefully provide in advance for the financial necessities of a political campaign, by building up or sustaining the great interests chiefly embodied in great corporations, such as railroads, banks, and protected industries; and thus the politicians and the monopolists grasp each other's hands in silent and clandestine fellowship.

In the recent conventions the monopolists and the office-seekers and office-holders did not fail to agree upon their plans of action. Their platforms placed both Houses of Congress in a state of paralysis as to the leading measures of reform, both as to finance and taxation, from which it is confidently expected that they may not recover before the next conventions are to be held, and certainly not during the existence of this Congress. The votes of the Territories and of the office-holders and ex-office-holders settled these matters when they appointed the electors for the States by naming the men for whom they should vote, and by pretending to prescribe to Congress the enactment of the laws that they have promised to the people, in the event that the doings of the one convention or the other are ratified by them in November. The conventions swarmed with office-holders, ex-office-holders and office-seekers, and they have ruled the States, great and small, with a rod of iron.

The constitutional plan of appointing electors is better than the national convention plan. It is the only plan by which the smaller States can ever assert their equality with the larger States

in the election of a President and Vice-President. Nearly every election under that plan may be decided by the equal votes of all the States in the House of Representatives. New York and Nevada would have equal power in the House, as they have equal suffrage in the Senate, and there would be no more of the domination of concentrated wealth and the more than feudal power of great corporations in Presidential elections. The direct representatives of the people, chosen in each district for their virtue and intelligence, without the pressure of a great and impending Presidential election, would be present in the House to care for the interests of the people, and to defend the right of every State to appoint its own electors for President and Vice-President in such manner as its legislature should prescribe. Such men, chosen under the constitution and laws, are safer guardians of the rights of the people and of the States than any convention we have ever had, and especially are they to be trusted with a firmer confidence than the turbulent assemblages of 1892, in which office-holders and ex-office-holders and delegates from Territories controlled in every movement and fixed every result. After all, no plan can be devised, while the constitution remains as it is, by which the Senate and the House of Representatives can be deprived of the power of counting the votes of electors, and we have seen in our history that the power to count is the final power to ascertain and declare who is elected, from which decision there is no appeal. In lodging this power in the Houses, our fathers were wise, even "above what is written."

Some day, not far removed, when the national conventions will have converted the whole system of Presidential elections into machinery for money-making and the capture of offices, the disgusted people will turn away from them and will again look, as our fathers did, upon the great office of elector as the salvation of the country. And, when the electors fail to elect a President or Vice-President, the States will come forward, as the second electoral body, through their representatives in the House, and, in their equal powers, they will exercise their highest duty towards the people and the government of the United States. If this could be done in 1892, the deliverance of the people from the power of self-seeking and ambitious schemers would signalize this as the most important epoch in American history.

Electors appointed by each State to represent its own interests

and the welfare of its own people, without regard to conventions of office-holders, ex-office-holders, office-seekers and territorial delegates, or to their edicts, would present every great and material interest of every State to the just consideration of the country and secure for it a full and fair hearing in Congress and elsewhere. As it is, the smaller States are utterly disregarded and their demands are repelled with indifference, or scouted with insult and scorn.

Any two or three such States, by taking such action, would alarm the politicians into a decent regard for their rights, and would gain, by constitutional means, at least a respectful hearing in the national councils.

The States elect the President and Vice-President. Their laws control in every stage of the election and no officer of the United States can have any part in the election, or in ascertaining the result, except to preserve the evidence furnished by the States that an election has been held. Everything has been provided in the constitution to relieve the States, when electing a President and Vice-President, from outside pressure, and from interference by those holding office under the United States; even to making them ineligible as electors.

The pressure of a national convention, applied by men of great national power and noted political generalship,—ex-cabinet ministers and the like,—tends to repress the independence of the newer and weaker States, if it does not terrorize them into abject submission. When the influence of these arbitrary and very skillful strategists is reinforced by the votes of delegates from the Territories who can have no voice in a Presidential election, the nature of the interference becomes dangerous.

The promise of offices to these self-constituted electors who infest the conventions, in the event of success, is considered the more binding because it is implied rather than expressed. In every sense that is material these delegates, by their votes in the conventions, will cast for their party the electoral votes of the States in which they secure a majority of votes. Being made expressly ineligible as electors, by the constitution, they grossly violate its spirit and purpose by usurping all the functions, powers, and duties of the electors appointed by the States. They so dwarf and degrade the great office of elector as to leave none of its functions to be performed by those who are, nominally, ap-

pointed by the States, except such as could be as well performed by a ten-year-old boy.

Then comes forth, naturally and as a logical consequence, the archfiend of bribery, and the whole country is alarmed and disgusted to find that the ballot is the mere merchandize of corruptionists and the wicked sport of gamblers. While the election is progressing, the amount of money spent in particular districts is considered the surest forecast of success, and the betting in political pool-rooms is bulletined, hourly, as the safest index to expected majorities. If this government can be preserved in the revulsion that the people will some day create to wipe out these iniquitous consequences of national nominating conventions, our country may be again congratulated on having escaped a more embarrassing danger than that which followed the great Civil War. If this is to be done, the States alone can accomplish it.

JOHN T. MORGAN.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE DEACONESS MOVEMENT.

WHETHER for success or failure, Deaconesses are established in the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the month of May, 1888, at the General Conference of that body, held in New York, the subject of their admission was carefully discussed and was referred to the Committee on Missions, of which Bishop Thoburn was chairman.

Everywhere to-day there is a cry for help for the suffering, and to the credit of humanity, be it said, that cry is not unheeded. The question of how to help has been the question of the hour; surely there never was one more deserving of our careful attention. The "groaning" of creation continues, notwithstanding the preaching, and the practising more or less, of Gospel precepts. We have, most of us, a favorite remedy for the ills which surround us, yet surely it is better to assist each other in this work of need than to criticise coldly the fashion of doing it.

I shall first give the regulations made by authority in the M. E. Church for the carrying out of the work of the Deaconess, but, though I give them in a condensed form, I have been careful to give the substance fully.

The first regulation defines the duties of the Deaconess. She is to care for the poor, the sick, the orphan; she is to pray with the dying and to comfort the sorrowful, and she is to devote herself exclusively to these occupations.

The second clause is not less important. It provides for the absolute liberty of each Deaconess, who is free to resign her charge at any moment, and there is an explicit declaration that no vows shall be exacted from her.

The third regulation provides for the control of the Deaconess' work, which is governed by the Annual Conference and a board of nine members, three of whom shall be women.

Fourth. This board confers authority (license) on each Deaconess, but no one can receive a certificate who is under 25 years of age, or who has not passed two years in training.

Fifth. This rule provides that no one shall be licensed as a Deaconess except on the recommendation of the Quarterly Conference, and the continued approval of this conference is necessary for the continuance of the Deaconess in her work.

Sixth. This regulation provides for the direction of the work of the Deaconess; when a Deaconess is working for a pastor she is under the direction of the pastor, who arranges her work. When a Deaconess is working in a Deaconess Home, she is under the direction of the superintendent of the Home.

The character and the qualifications of a person who presents herself as

a candidate for the office of Deaconess is made the subject of careful investigation by the members of the Quarterly Conference. "This body," says the Rev. Henry Wheeler, in his recent work, "Deaconesses Ancient and Modern," "consists of every officer of the local church, and is presided over by the presiding elder, who is a member of the bishop's cabinet or council. This body, following the analogy furnished by the licensing of local preachers, will inquire into the gifts, grace, and usefulness of such candidate, and the way will be rigidly barred against all who cannot furnish satisfactory evidence of a good, clear, religious experience and a pure moral life."

It would seem as if every precaution and safeguard had been adopted which wisdom could devise, and yet we have heard of difficulties in one of these institutions which show that human nature is very much what human nature always has been, but it has also proved that the women who are at the fore-front of this movement are more desirous of efficient than of numerous members.

Before entering further into the working plans as at present existing in Methodist Deaconess institutions, I may say a word of those which have been inaugurated in the Presbyterian Church. The existence of Deaconesses is also an established fact in the Presbyterian body, but, as might be expected from those who have in their midst the old Covenanter martyr spirit, they have determined to steer as clear as possible of any approach to the religious sisterhoods of Rome. The Presbyterian Deaconess wears no costume, and does not attempt community life. She lives in the world, and with her friends, and is in fact the counterpart of the Scripture reader of the English Evangelical Church, plus a dedication service. She resembles more closely the active Deaconess of the early church, of which Phebe of Cenchrea is the model and the traditional type. It will be a curious and an interesting study for the future religious humanitarian to watch the outcome of these different attempts to revive an ancient custom, which certainly has apostolic countenance.

The Methodist Deaconess has adopted a costume, not without much discussion and difference of opinion, even amongst those who are most intimately concerned. So much could be said for and against this arrangement that no doubt it was a question difficult to decide, but I could not help admiring the spirit of one of its most earnest advocates when she said: "All these arrangements may be changed at any time, and I for one will agree with the majority." It may be said that the wearing or not wearing of a certain dress matters very little, but forms are most certainly the expression of certain mental attitudes and opinion, and as such have an importance all their own. Those who had any experience of what were most appropriately called the "surplice riots" in England, some years since, would agree with our idea on this point.

The Methodist Deaconess also lives in community as a rule. Still, exceptional cases are provided for when the Deaconess, either alone or with a companion, may go anywhere to assist a pastor. But if I am rightly informed, even in this case she would live apart. I should say, however, that the Deaconess is not obliged to wear her distinctive dress when she visits her family or leaves the institution for her annual holiday. No doubt it is anticipated that the Deaconess will hold her office for life, for an especial provision is made for her comfort in sickness and for her home in later years, when she, too, will need all the care and loving attendance which she has given for so many long years to others.

Obviously she is legislated for as one apart. Yet if her personal liberty of choice or change is jealously protected, if she is not made to feel, as in the case of the Roman Catholic sister, that she forfeits the esteem, if not the religious virtue, of her character if she retires from her work, all these regulations are greatly to her advantage.

There is a difference of opinion amongst the best authorities as to the identity of widows and Deaconesses in the early church, but there is no question that there were women who were set apart for the service of the church, and that this order of voluntary and free servitors was superseded, later and gradually, by cloistered sisters, who in later ages have almost given place to the active organs of the Roman Church. St. Chrysostom spoke of his friend Olympias as "the Deaconess, most worthy and beloved of God."

Pastor Fliedner, of Kaiserswerth, has the honor of being the first to revive the ancient order of Deaconesses, though, as early as 1575, some Protestant refugees from Holland established a Deaconess work at Wesel, in Germany, but the attempt ended in failure. In 1836 statutes were drawn up for the first German Deaconess Society, through the instrumentality of Pastor Fliedner, who went through the usual vicissitudes which are the inevitable trial of every successful work. His institution has flourished marvellously, though it met at first with all kinds of opposition; it was opposed by many Protestants, because they feared, not unnaturally, that it was a step Romewards; it needed the test of time to show how very far this was from being true. It was opposed bitterly by Roman Catholics, although in this country they have taken the inception of Deaconess work by Protestant churches as a compliment, saying that "imitation is the highest form of flattery." In Germany, however, it was very different. Romanists compared the work of Fliedner to that of the apostate Julian, who established Pagan institutions of a charitable character, to show that Christians had not a monopoly of good works. They prophesied his speedy downfall, a prophecy in which the prophet prophesied according to his desire, which was not fulfilled. So far was it from an unfavorable result, that in 1861, when the twenty-fifth anniversary of Pastor Fliedner's Deaconess Home was celebrated, there were twenty-seven Deaconess houses founded, and to day there are fifteen hundred houses, and the Deaconesses have numbered seven thousand one hundred, and thus has the little grain of mustard seed grown up into the great and magnificent tree of success. The work of these German Deaconesses embraces every form of charity and helpfulness to suffering humanity. They have established schools, colleges, orphanages, lunatic asylums, hospitals, homes for the aged, and a "House of Evening Rest" for the aged or infirm Deaconesses. It should be noted that the Deaconesses have the control of whatever property they may have, and are perfectly free as to their testamentary disposition of the same. Nor is there any system of so-called religious obedience. Nothing is required from the Deaconess except an observance of the regulations of the Home, such as would be necessary in any public institution.

In England the Mildmay Deaconess system founded by the Rev. W. Pennefather, a Protestant clergyman of the Low Church Episcopal school, has been a marvellous success, numbering its workers by hundreds. Indeed, the success of these institutions depends absolutely on the large and Christian spirit in which they are carried out.

In this country the German Deaconess Home has not been the success which was anticipated when the costly Mary Drexel Home was established

in Philadelphia. As a general rule the erection of costly institutions does not promote the ends which are anticipated. Workers are far more needed than buildings, though of course for certain work special establishments are needed. I believe no one feels this lack of helpers more keenly than the superintendent of this institution.

The American Methodist Deaconesses have been more successful in the matter of numbers, but they also ask, Where are the helpers, for the fields are ripe for the harvest?

Mrs. Lucy Rider Meyer is the first person who gave practical shape to the Methodist Deaconess work in this country. She and her husband were the principals of the Chicago Training School for City, Home and Foreign Missions, and the Deaconess work just grew out of this. The students who were training for the foreign mission were sent out two afternoons in the week to visit the sick and the poor. It was then that the immense need for constant, devoted work amongst our poorer brethren was fully realized. The work was there ; as Mrs. Meyer truly said in an address at Chautauqua, "We talk of our Pilgrim Fathers, but what are we doing for our pagan brothers?"

The third annual Conference of the Deaconesses of the Methodist Episcopal Church was held at Chautauqua. The two previous conferences were held at Chicago and at Ocean Grove. If one may judge by the increase in three years the next Conference will show a very large addition to the numbers both of Deaconesses and of sympathizers. Already there are one hundred in the field, and representatives were present from every large town in the United States. Bishop Thoburn represented six Deaconesses' homes, well established in India. He invited the next Conference to meet in Calcutta, when the place of reunion was under consideration. With all the advances in modern science such a reunion may not be an impossibility in the near future.

M. F. CUSACK.

ART STUDENTS IN ITALY.

IN THE hope of being useful to those of my countrymen who purpose to establish themselves in Italy, either for the study or the practice of art, I offer, by way of suggestion, some views derived from a long residence in Italy in an official capacity, and from an intimate association with many of the most prominent American, foreign, and native painters and sculptors in Florence, Rome, Milan and Naples.

Italy has peculiar advantages for art-training generally, and especially for sculpture. In this regard Florence is second to no other city, not even Rome. The capital of Italy may excel in its galleries of antique sculpture and in the greater commerce of painters and amateurs from all parts of the world, but the student will find it much dearer in rents, labor, and the general cost of living, and it has besides the very serious drawback of insalubrity during several months of the year. Florence, on the contrary, is healthy in all seasons, far cheaper as a residence, and has the decided advantage of being near the celebrated quarries of Carrara and Ceravezza, which supply the finest statuary marble known. Indeed sculptors in America find it greatly to their interest to send their models to Italy to be put into marble or bronze on account of the large saving in the cost, as well as on account of the greater choice of material. The famous bronze foundry of the late Professor Papi

belongs to Florence, and is, I believe, the only one in existence which possesses the secrets and the facilities for casting work of all sizes without joints, and which will not require repairs and chasings afterward. Florence, Rome and Milan have a numerous corps of skilful workmen in all branches of art, many of whom are competent to execute original work of high merit, although they are accustomed to labor for wages such as are given in America to the common mechanic or day laborer.

The advantage of having these well-instructed and capable workmen to execute from the model the conceptions of the legitimate artist is too obvious to be questioned. Although the practice is liable to misconception, in itself it is rightful, economical, and artistic, doubling the executive power of the artist himself, who can reserve his strength for invention, modeling, and finishing, the manual labor proper being left to the individual who makes this department of art his lifelong occupation. An abundance of this sort of highly trained labor of extraordinary cheapness, as compared with charges at other great centres of art, is to be found in Florence.

The history, scenery, associations, and ambitions of Florence are deeply imbued with the sentiments and feelings most suggestive and inciting to the American artist, and which he finds lamentably deficient at home. Consequently, viewing Florence as almost unique in the quality and means of its art training, I am disposed to highly recommend it as a residence for the student. This recommendation, however, must be qualified by stating that it applies to the matured artist or student, rather than to the mere pupil. As regards the elementary studies America now presents sufficient means of instruction, and either London, Paris, Antwerp, Munich, or Dusseldorf, in strictly academic resources and in variety of technical excellence, is superior to Florence or Rome. The youthful American artist should therefore defer going abroad until he has first laid a solid foundation of instruction in his own country, and sufficiently established his artistic constitution on the basis of his own nationality, so as not to become a mere copyist or imitator of other schools and styles. Then he can breathe to advantage the higher atmosphere of the great masters in art.

The student must be prepared for years of hard study and prolonged pecuniary strain. Although living and professional training and practice are cheap, as compared with America, yet it is not less true that the general standard of art excellence, owing to the enlivening presence of the greatest achievements of the past, is of the highest, whilst the concourse of eminent artists of all nationalities makes competition the closest and the prices the least, so that the chances of patronage are less than in America, or England, or France, or even Germany. In Italy the American has not only artists of his own nation as rivals, but those of all Europe; and, besides, art is judged on its own abstract merits. Though the artist may subsist on less money in Italy than in America, he may find it more difficult to earn a franc in the former country than a dollar in the latter. An Italian artist, as a common rule, is content to receive a franc when his American brother would expect fivefold the sum, and frequently for art of less merit in every way.

I should fail in doing my whole duty did I not also point out the noteworthy fact of the inventive faculty of the Italian artists and their facility in adapting themselves and their art to the current taste of American buyers. In this they show great ingenuity, and are able in a considerable degree to place the American artist domiciled in Italy at a great disadvantage.

In two points, however, our American artists more than hold their own. These are in the execution of portrait-busts and statues and of the costly monuments in commemoration of the deeds and results of the late War of the Rebellion. Notwithstanding some of the egregious failures, judged by the strictest principles of art, which unfortunately are to be seen even in the Capital of our nation, our artists display such remarkable aptitude for portraiture of this kind and such constructive skill as to cause some regret that these works might not in general have been deferred until a few years more of instruction on the part of the artists and of growth in public taste—a conjunction that would have called forth better things.

The liberal commissions originating in patriotic feelings, awarded for monuments destined, perhaps, to endure as long as the Republic itself, serve to foster American art in all classes, and conduce to the education of the people in the direction of art. Irrespective of the question of price it is wise and proper that their execution should be intrusted to Americans themselves.

If our artists will thoroughly imbue themselves with American feelings and aspirations, the living ideas and aims of their country, before going abroad, they will be better prepared to appreciate all that Italy offers them, and will, moreover, have a stronger hold on their countrymen in the competition from the artists of all nations. It depends on themselves to rise to the level of their opportunity as conscientious and well trained artists, inspired by a passion for their profession, or to sink to the mere commercial phase, struggling for pecuniary success, reckless of the quality of their work, of the plagiarisms and other makeshifts for getting on rapidly.

With the aim of attaining technical mastery of color and the laws of composition it would be wise to study closely the old masters, as was always done by the great masters of the intermediate schools, like Velasquez, Rubens, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and their contemporaries, a practice which is almost entirely neglected by American painters, who are more ambitious to create art, as it were, anew, in their own work. So far as this tends to original invention it is praiseworthy, but it necessarily retards technical progress.

At the best, the genuine artist has to live long on hopes deferred, before he makes his way to the front; which, if not mistaken in himself, he is certain to do in time. But our American student should not forget that however favorable may be the verdict of partial friends in a country in which there exists no lofty standard of art or public appreciation of it, he makes his new venture in the old world, where knowledge is ripe and opinion most critical. It is a trying ordeal, and often one which, too self-confident on account of his previous career at home, the student is poorly prepared to meet.

With no class of artists is this more evident than with singers, especially young girls, who are obliged to face the pitiless criticisms, the malignant intrigues of the public theatres, under different conditions, as a preliminary step to their successful recognition.

Every year sends more of our country-women to Italy to prepare themselves for the stage, whose qualifications of voice and person, however flattered in America, by no means fit them for a successful career in that country, in which indeed their very sex, instead of being some protection, as in America, is quite the reverse. Their position in the meanwhile is aggravated by their ignorance or disregard of habits and opinions very

foreign to those they have been accustomed to at home. From the outset they are liable to be victimized by being insidiously encouraged by interested persons to pursue, at a heavy expense for years, studies to fit them for the operatic stage, only at last, after paying an extravagant fee for a *début* trial, to utterly fail, either from absolute inability or through the plots of jealous rivals. They may then find themselves destitute in a foreign land, beset by temptations and poverty. Several sad cases of shipwrecked fortunes and character in this class having come to my own personal knowledge, it is my opinion that none, unless she possesses unquestionable talent and voice, and has sufficient means to render her entirely independent of the result, should make this venture in Italy. For every success there are many failures; at the same time, when the conditions are favorable, there is no country that has such great facilities for the training of an opera singer, and the beginning of a successful career.

It is true there have been examples of remarkable and praiseworthy success under most adverse circumstances, due entirely to the energy and ability displayed by the young ladies themselves. In thus plainly presenting the disadvantages and trials which all must more or less meet, I do not wish to discourage anyone from attempting a professional career in Italy, but only to state the adverse facts for the consideration of the persons most interested.

JOHN SCHUYLER CROSBY.

FARM ORGANIZATION.

THE farmer of to-day finds himself the subject of much discussion. By one class of writers it is argued that legislation is to blame for his pitiable condition; by another, that it is the result of his own laziness and improvidence. Let us look at this last charge. How many farmers are there who do not spend the most of the working days in hard toil? It seems to my observation, at least, that it is not more work and less leisure that is needed, but more intelligence, more time spent in the cultivation of the mind and in the study of right methods. We hear argued on every side that in the trades intelligent laborers accomplish more work with less expenditure of time and energy than ignorant, uninformed workmen. If this is true in manufactories, it is equally true in agriculture. The fact that a man resides in the country and gets his living by working in harmony with nature and nature's laws is not a just reason for shutting him out from the world of intellectual effort.

We would not think that the farmer of this country, in order to become successful in obtaining a comfortable living, to care for his own and add to the welfare of his country, must have his eyes forever fastened on his task and his thoughts directed to nothing beyond or above it. The man who has worked from sunrise to sunset five days in the week has a right to spend the sixth as he chooses. But if he be helped to the cultivation of intellect and taste, to the spirit of inquiry, and be put in the way of general culture, then indeed will his holidays—his few hours of rest—be well spent.

He has lately awakened to the fact that while labor in every other department is organized, while the combinations of capital are firm and invincible, he alone depends upon himself; and here lies his much-extolled independence. He alone is at the mercy of all others, and to become able to compete in a fair field with his oppressor he must unite with those who are

in the same situation. Already has the wisdom of the farmer's choice been seen in the unusual interest taken in his demands and opinions, in the efforts of political parties and others affected to either placate the organization of the farmers or to cry it down. We hear prophecies of the organization's inevitable shortness of life, and all sorts of statements as to its inability to cope with the questions and issues it proposes to handle. It is said that it does not embody a national idea,—that no organization that is not founded upon a national principle can live long; also, that it is in the interest of a class, and therefore bound to go down. The truth or falsity of all this must depend upon what we consider our nation to be. Is it not for the people, and do we not claim equal rights for all, special privileges to none?

Look at our body of laws to-day. What are the farmer's rights and privileges? He has the right to sell his products at prices fixed for him in New York and Liverpool; the right to buy what he cannot produce at prices dictated to him by manufacturers and middlemen without limit; but no voice in either case in determining either price or profits. He pays one-half of the taxes, but a glance at our national Congress shows that he has small influence in making the laws.

Not a few of those who write upon the subject would have us think that politics is not his province; that the farmer's place is on the farm, his work the tilling of the soil, and that to the intellectual and monied class belongs the ability and therefore the right to construct the laws and "take care of the country." Too long have the farmers by their conduct, if not in reality, consented to this state of things; but those good days of propriety are gone. The farmer of to-day insists upon meddling with politics, and even demands that those who legislate shall recognize his existence and the agricultural interests of the country. These interests have to some extent been recognized and these demands partially considered. That this is true is either directly or indirectly due to the farmer's agitation. In even so short a time have good results to the farmer followed the work of the organization.

Not only in financial and political affairs will he derive benefit from the association, but in intellectual as well as in social life will good results surely follow. He has been aroused and brought to think, to realize his position and attempt to find means to better it. He sees the politician controlling legislation for the benefit of capitalists, trusts, and combines, favoring the few at the expense of the many and particularly at the expense of the farmer. He finds that upon the owners of real estate falls the great burden of the taxes of the country; that the railroad monopolies by their high shipping rates make it impossible for him to realize a fair profit on his products; in short, that he is oppressed by every organization of capital and by all political schemes. He intends to meet organization with organization.

With strengthened interests in legislation comes a desire for better information, a more intimate acquaintance with political economy and the principles of good government, the wish to be able to meet the lawyer on his own ground,—in truth, to be better informed than he, for, to begin with, the farmer has that experience and knowledge which the city man can not acquire. In this distinctive fact lies the trouble. The men who legislate know nothing of or care nothing for the needs of the farmer. All he means to them is a vote more or a vote less. He is congratulated when prices are high and argued with when they are low. Those men who have for their sole object increase of profits and those who favor class legislation are withdrawing from the

organization, which leaves the permanent element that is striving to better the condition and raise the plane of the farmer's life. With these aims in view the farmers have arranged a course of study in farming economics and general subjects on the Chautauqua plan, hoping to become better acquainted with their own needs and the needs of their country.

Once started on the road of study we find that the outlook broadens and includes that all-round culture more easily obtained in the city than in the country, but just as valuable to the farmer's family as to their more favorably situated cousins. The isolation which has perhaps been the greatest hindrance to the farmer's growth is in a measure overcome. In their study of social and political topics in the local organization the members have the advantage which comes from numbers, the wider range of thought, the more varied experience.

The conventions also have their educational value, bringing together, as they do, men of varying grades of ability from different sections of the country, with different casts of thought and inherited tendencies, giving them the opportunity to discuss the questions of especial value to themselves from different points of view as well as in the light of their common interest. The capable men are recognized and intrusted with offices and duties, and the less fortunate are stimulated to effort.

Already we see the beneficial effects of this uprising in the animated interest taken by the press and the people in subjects formerly unheeded. The people of the cities are being made to see the wrongs and injustice suffered by the class upon whom they are dependent for wealth, prosperity, and even the very necessities of life. They are beginning to feel that a change must come in the management of the interests of the tillers of the soil, or farming will sink to so low a state as to be engaged in only by foreigners and the lowest class of the country, falling sooner or later to the condition of serfdom.

If we take a glance at the history of the great reforms we see that they have originated with the oppressed,—have emanated from below upward. Where have we in history an example of the class benefited by the then-existing state of things adopting broader views and more equitable measures? It is only when resistance becomes so strong as to threaten their interests that we find them listening to the appeals of the common people.

The permanence of the Alliance, the effect of this reform, must depend upon its ability to accomplish its two-fold purpose: First, to arouse a public interest in the condition of the farmer, and secure for him political recognition and financial fairness; second, to develop the farmer himself and incite him to intellectual exertion and efforts in the way of social culture, to lead him to a higher, broader, more beautiful life. We shall find that the results depend not so much upon legislation as upon enlightenment.

NEWTON L. BUNNELL.

A TIME TO BE OUT OF DOORS.

I WONDER what most people think "out doors" was intended for any way? To be avoided, one would think, judging by the way they appear to shun it on every possible occasion. The business man comes down to his hurried breakfast, takes his carriage at the door or his street car or railway

car as near the door as he can possibly get it, hurries into his stuffy, half-lighted office, dashes out for thirty minutes at lunch time, packs himself into another air-tight receptacle for his homeward ride, eats his dinner, and sits and smokes in his parlor, or goes to a theatre and remains till a late hour in air which has forgotten the feeling of sunshine, and whose very touch would make the leaves of the forest shudder and droop. Is it any wonder that at thirty he is a prey to dyspepsia, and that neuralgia "marks him for her own," and silvers his hair even before his prime?

The business man's wife on the other hand is far too busily occupied with the household cares to think of stepping out of doors, even for a few minutes, until the middle of the afternoon, when, dressed, too often literally "within an inch of her life," in garments which render vigorous walking, or even breathing, utterly incompatible with comfort, she sallies forth per carriage or car to "make a few calls" or do some shopping, during either of which missions her main object seems to be to avoid the open air as much as possible; while her evenings are spent under her own roof in half-ventilated apartments, or in the overheated second-hand atmosphere of some drawing-room or theatre.

Their poor children, just in the very "cabbage-leaf" stage of their development, when every molecular change that takes place in their little bodies requires the assistance of fresh air and sunlight, are condemned to pass seven-eighths of their waking hours cooped up in schoolrooms or nurseries. They mustn't play in the streets, for fear of getting run over or having their morals corrupted by bad boys; their back-yards are so sooty and sunless that they scarcely care to spend any time in them, even if not forbidden to do so for fear of the disastrous effects upon white pinafores and clean frocks; so that the only out-door life the poor little things enjoy is a prim daily promenade with the nursemaid, or a short run in immaculate public or private parks where they may indeed be considered "of more value than many sparrows," but of vastly less importance than the geraniums and the grass, and they are compelled to conduct themselves accordingly.

As for the children of the poor, their only playground is the gutter, and their only view of God's sunlight is through its reeking vapors, as a petition to Mayor Hewitt, of New York, impressed upon us with startling distinctness in its terribly significant statement that from the Battery to Tenth Street, comprising a population of hundreds of thousands, not a single park or public space is to be found where the children can play without danger of arrest by "one of the finest." Is it anything to be surprised at that this class of children are so sadly apt to grow up stunted and warped, morally and intellectually as well as physically? But it is unnecessary to multiply instances; the facts are all around us, even down to our small country towns. The merchant, the lawyer, the business man, all live as if their cardinal principle were to keep indoors just as large a proportion of their time as they possibly could.

How different all this is from what the Creator intended, and from what Nature demands if we will only listen to her. Did it ever strike you that, with all our self-conceit, we are physically only a higher order of vegetable, after all, and dependent upon the very same conditions for health and growth? The human flowers need just as much sunlight as any geranium or nasturtium, and we pine just as certainly if we don't get it; and yet in how many of our living-rooms will flowers flourish? Scarcely in one in ten, and then only in the windows which we generally relinquish to them to take a

back seat ourselves. With all my love for flowers I declare I can hardly regard them as better than vampires or cannibals when I see them crowding into the only sunny windows, greedily monopolizing all the fresh air and sunlight in the room while the human plants struggle along in the shade; or basking all day long in the sunlight in crystal-roofed and crystal-sided apartments, while the dear little human flowerets are cooped up in some brick-walled room upstairs, which at the best may have a few panes of glass looking to the south. Keep our flowers where we keep our children, and any florist can foretell the result. If we would just let our little ones occupy the bay-windows and conservatories, and keep our flowers back by the walls, we might not have as many bouquets, but we certainly would have healthier, rosier children, happier homes, and fewer "mysterious dispensations of Providence" to murmur at. Much might be done by abolishing those abominations, blinds, shutters, and closed windows, and giving the fresh air and sunlight of heaven free access to all our rooms,—but then the carpets and the furniture: "The sun will ruin them," says Mrs. Housekeeper. Well, for pity's sake, madam, if you must choose between colorless children and faded carpets, let the Brussels be sacrificed

But this, after all, is only a mitigation of the severities of their imprisonment. We must learn more confidence in Nature, and trust ourselves and our little ones freely to her rough but kind embrace, without the enervating and often injurious protection of walls and roof. We must remember that houses are not to live in, but only to shelter in when from any cause we are shut out of our grand native mansion, the open air.

In this open air our life should be spent, and we are only justified in leaving it for shelter from the inclemencies of the weather or for protection against enemies. Nature demands an apology and a valid excuse for every hour spent indoors. I sometimes think we are making a mistake in building our houses so large and commodious and attractive, gilding the cage so gaudily that we almost make our little human birds prefer captivity to freedom. Houses should be comfortable but not so luxurious as to make us forget their real use and prefer them to out-of-doors. It is astonishing what filthy, dark, unventilated holes healthy savages can use with impunity for eating and sleeping-places so long as they regard them in the true light, and LIVE in the open air.

That the unwillingness of our Indian wards to exchange their airy tepees for practically air-tight, stove-heated boxes of logs or boards, is based upon a deeper instinct than mere savage custom, is abundantly proved by the frightful mortality which almost invariably attends this so-called "civilizing" process."

Their plan of a fire on the floor and a mere hole in the roof for a chimney, which absolutely necessitated the door being left open in order to keep up a draught, was not without its advantages. Even a modern "smoky chimney" is not an unmitigated evil.

We Anglo-Saxons ought, of all races, to be the last to fail to appreciate the value of fresh air and sunlight, for our striking characteristic is and always has been a passionate devotion to open-air life and sports. Indeed this passion may be not unfairly regarded as the mainspring of that indomitable physical and intellectual vigor which has made us the great pioneers and colony-builders of the world. Even apart from the invigorating effects of open-air exercise, I think we hardly sufficiently appreciate the value of direct sunshine. All life, so far as we can understand it, consists in

the conjuring up of the Great Sun-Spirit by those mighty wizards, chlorophyll and hæmoglobin, the emerald and crimson "life-essences" of the vegetable and animal worlds respectively. A distinguished scientist has aptly and beautifully defined it as "organized sunlight." Of course we can and must obtain much of this literally vital element at second-hand, by combustion from "black diamonds" and hickory logs, or by digestion, from bread and beefsteak, but no organism can really flourish without obtaining a certain portion of its supply direct. "Basking in the sun" is in itself of real and considerable benefit, and it is no compliment to our human intelligence to find that cats and dogs understand that fact much better than we do. Even the "blue glass" craze had a truth underlying it, and owed such success as it achieved to the proportion of sunlight which penetrated its colored medium.

The love of sunshine is naturally one of our strongest instincts, and we should be far healthier and happier if we followed and developed it instead of practically ignoring and repressing it. How a sparkling, sunny morning exhilarates us and makes us feel that "it's too fine a day to spend indoors," and yet how few holidays are taken for that reason. The wealth of the sunbeams is poured out lavishly all around us, and we turn from it to struggle for a few pitiful handfuls of something else that is yellow and shining, but not half so likely to bring us happiness, and often has strange, red spots upon it. Give nature a chance, and we shall find that there is more than a mere fanciful connection between natural sunlight and that "sunny" disposition, which, after all, is the true "philosopher's stone."

WOODS HUTCHINSON, M. D.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXX.

SEPTEMBER, 1892.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE QUEEN.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

TO HER MAJESTY, THE QUEEN:

MADAM: From the death-bed of him who made two continents one with fire from Heaven, I bear a message praying Your Majesty's mediation in the cause of international friendship.

When he stood in his strong prime who has this day fallen on sleep—that immortal whom your own immortal, John Bright, named "the Columbus of modern times who, by his cable, had moored the new world alongside of the old"—behind him and beside him stood another strong and silent man, with hand and heart and purse helping in the work.

Now the child and the grandchild of that silent partner are in the sorest straits that ever befell woman—strangers in a strange land,—one immured in a prison for life, the other, with the wonderful persistence of a mother's exquisite agony, vainly struggling to open those prison doors. The watchers by the dying pillow, in their own consecrated sorrow, remember the thousandfold greater sorrow of the widow and orphan; and in their behalf, for their behoof, I receive and remit to you this reminder of international courtesy, hoping that it may revive the tender grace of a day that is dead.

In our late troublous time, to which you, Madam, conjointly with your best beloved dead, lent an olive branch of peace and friendly consideration that won our everlasting gratitude—on the

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

15th of March, 1863—the schooner "J. M. Chapman" was seized in the harbor of San Francisco by the United States revenue officers, while sailing, or about to sail, on a cruise against the commerce of the United States. The case came for trial at the October term, 1863. The testimony showed that Alfred Rubery, a native of England, and others, had, under pretext of acting in the interest of Mexico, purchased a ship, arms, ammunition, brass cannon, shells, fuse, powder, muskets, lead, caps, knives, and uniforms, for the purpose of taking mail steamships and other vessels plying between San Francisco and Panama. They had made a voyage to Cerros Island for the purpose of examining into its fitness as a depot and rendezvous whence to attack Panama steamers. They had shipped a large quantity of lumber with which to construct berths, a prison room, and a lower deck. Their plans and route were prepared in detail, a false manifesto was sworn to, fifteen men were smuggled in among the cargo, and they had already cast off the lines and begun working the schooner out from the wharf when they were boarded and seized by the United States.

Of their guilt was no doubt. The revenue officers had been aware of the intended enterprise and had kept a constant watch on the vessel night and day. They had noted all the movements. Papers torn, chewed, and partially burned were found strewed about the hold, and two sailors, who had been confined over night to prevent them from leaving the vessel, testified that some of the party had employed the time intervening between the boarding of the vessel and the opening of the hatchway in destroying papers. Loaded pistols and bowie knives were found stowed away in the interstices between the packages and the cargo. In Rubery's baggage were found a proclamation to the people of California to throw off the authority of the people of the United States, and a plan for the capture of the United States forts at San Francisco, and the form of an oath of fidelity to the cause, which Rubery admitted that he had spent some time in preparing.

The evidence was complete and overpowering. The case was tried before the Circuit Court of the Northern District of California over which Mr. Justice Field, brother of Cyrus Field, was then presiding. "In a calm spirit of judicial inquiry and unaffected by the excitements of the hour or the fierce passions nec-

essarily aroused by the stupendous contest in which the country was engaged," Judge Field laid down his argument on the lines prescribed by Judge Story, that "the most sacred right of every party accused of crime is that the jury should respond as to the facts and the court as to the law."

The jury responded to proven and indeed undenied facts with a verdict of guilty, and Rubery was sentenced to a fine and to ten years' imprisonment—a light penalty for so heavy a crime.

Soon afterwards, when Judge Field had taken his seat on the bench of the Supreme Court in Washington, John Bright sent a letter asking for the pardon of this English convict. Judge Field doubted and might well doubt whether President Lincoln would grant such a pardon or ought to grant it. Judge Field was a Californian and he knew how deeply and justly incensed were the people of San Francisco at the plot of an Englishman, which threatened millions of treasure and hundreds of lives, and he found they might hotly resent any interference with the cause of justice.

But he went to the President with John Bright's letter and his own representations and the pardon was promptly granted. In Vol. IV. of the Law Reports, following the report of the case, it is duly recorded: "The pardon of Rubery was granted as a mark of respect and good will to Mr. Bright by whom it had been solicited."

In the year of our Lord 1889 an American stood at the bar of an English court—a woman, frightened, shrinking, fainting—and heard her terrible verdict of guilt and her terrible doom of death. She was but twenty-six years of age. By long expatriation she had become a stranger in her own land, but she was of a family eminent in many branches, in military and civil service, in law, literature and theology. All her American associations and connections are of refinement, of culture, of virtue.

The verdict and the sentence were so opposed to the expectations raised by the evidence that the Secretary of State for the Home Department was forced by the popular revolt to review the case, and by this review to quash the indictment for murder, to reverse the verdict of guilty of murder, and to remit the penalty of death.

But the prisoner was not released. She remains to this day enduring the rigorous penalty of imprisonment for life.

Her wide circle of relatives in America petitioned through the

regular channels for her release, but without effect. By the unwearying devotion of her most accomplished and most unhappy mother her case was brought to the notice of Mrs. Harrison, the wife of the President of the United States,—a woman who was never known to turn away from any good cause, and whose warm, motherly heart was touched by the sorrow of this *mater dolorosa*. She heard the sighing of the prisoner, and at once sent to you, Madam, this petition for her relief.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, Aug. 7, 1891.

To Her Majesty, the Queen:

MADAM: The four and fifty years of your illustrious reign have estabtablished you in the respect and love of the citizens of this Republic.

Confiding in the power of your Majesty and in the power of your goodness, we pray your grace in behalf of our young countrywoman, Florence Maybrick, a widow, a mother, fatherless, brotherless, wearing out in prison a life sentence of penal servitude upon the charge of murdering her husband by arsenical poisoning.

The beneficent law of England, which has become so largely the basis of personal rights in our own country, requires that the proof of guilt should remove every reasonable doubt, and it is understood here that the Secretary of State for the Home Department of the English Government, upon a review of the evidence in Mrs. Maybrick's case, concluded that there was a reasonable doubt whether Mr. Maybrick died of arsenical poisoning, and upon this ground commuted the sentence of death to imprisonment for life. There seems to be the very highest medical and scientific authority in support of the proposition that Mr. Maybrick's symptoms were not compatible with arsenical poisoning. There was, it is understood, an entire absence of proof that Mrs. Maybrick administered or attempted to administer arsenic to her husband with intent to kill; while evidence that Mr. Maybrick had been in the habit of taking arsenic as a medicine was present in the case.

In view of all these facts, we earnestly, respectfully, and trustfully entreat of your most gracious Majesty a pardon and release for Mrs. Maybrick.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) CAROLINE SCOTT HARRISON,
HARRIET STANWOOD BLAINE,
ANNE M. FOSTER,
ELLEN R. RUSK.

To this was added the explanatory note by the Secretary of State:

"The signatures are those of the wife of the President, the wife of the Secretary of State, the wife of the Secretary of the Treasury, the wife of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The other ladies of the cabinet were too widely separated for the summer recess to be reached, while the suffering of the victim cried for the speediest relief.

To this petition the wife of the President of the United States received no response. If any reply were made it must

have been considered of a nature to give no pleasure to the exalted lady who had sent the petition and to those who had joined their request to hers. I have heard a rumor that Your Majesty received the petition graciously, but of that we need no assurance. The royal courtesy which has marked your long reign, which has not only endeared you to your subjects, but has made all English-speaking people your subjects by the most divine of rights, and which has been so powerful an influence in preserving the peace of Europe, needs not to be officially attested to us, nor has a hundred years' experience led us to any doubt of the reception which will always be accorded by her peers to the wife of the President of the United States.

On the presumption that this petition might not have been presented to the judgment of Your Majesty, as royal in wisdom as in rank, the attention of your Private Secretary, Sir Henry Ponsonby, was solicited in the following letter:

SIR: The Queen of England is, by her high personal character, Queen of the United States of America as well. When she took the world into her confidence and told us the beautiful romance of her life, the story of her Knight without fear and without reproach, she laid a spell upon the hearts of all women, never to be broken, and made domestic love no less than royal ability the lofty token of her most illustrious reign.

We in America, who

> "Esteem that wedded hand less dear for sceptre than for ring,
> And hold her uncrowned womanhood to be the royal thing,"

watch the Queen evermore with a jealousy born of love, and cannot permit even the shadow of a shadow to rest upon that royal hand which carries the highest standard of the womanhood of the nineteenth century.

Yet the machinery of justice in the Queen's England is persisting in an act of injustice. The machinery of law, in the Queen's name, is holding an innocent young American woman in torture. The Queen, who mourns the loss of her children, and the late loss of her grandson, the heir of England, is made to stand before the world in the attitude of depriving another mother of her only child, of all her grandchildren. Mrs. Maybrick is in Woking Prison for life upon a charge of which she has never been accused, and for which she has never been tried. This cannot be English justice. She was tried for the murder of her husband. The judge charged the jury that it was necessary to an unfavorable verdict that her husband died of arsenic. The Home Secretary, after an exhaustive investigation, found that there is a reasonable doubt whether her husband died of arsenic. Why, then, is she in prison? It cannot be English justice that keeps her there. It is not English law, for it is the essence of English law that one is innocent until he is proven guilty. This young American, widow, daughter, mother, can be buried alive in Woking Prison only on the principle that one is guilty until he is proven innocent.

Even on that principle she is proven innocent so far as a negative can

ever be proven. The highest medical authority in Great Britain plainly, even eagerly, testifies that all the symptoms in Mr. Maybrick's case pointed away from arsenic as the cause of death. Not one jot or tittle of evidence has been brought forward that Mrs. Maybrick ever administered or attempted to administer poison to her husband.

While life lasts or her slavery endures, I shall not cease to work for the release of Mrs. Maybrick—whom I have never seen, and of whom I first heard through the agonized entreaties of her mother for the intervention of the State Department. The Secretary of State has moved in the matter through the American Minister. American women have contributed a fund said to be requisite for a further consideration of the case.

It is now in the hands of eminent lawyers in London, and the more it is presented in detail the more incredible appears the violation of law, of justice, of humanity.

If all these resources fail to rescue this woman from her undeserved dungeon, her wrongs will be referred to Congress for international expostulation and redress.

But through all the law's delay, and the delay necessary to the courtesy of nations, the innocent young mother, of gentle birth and breeding, is in a convict cell, deprived of children, of mother, of liberty—far worse than to be deprived of life—wearing her young years away in the desolation of degradation. How glorious the triumph of royal womanhood if, striking across all the mental malady and mistaken zeal which thrust the prisoner into darkness, and the blind loyalty to error once committed which keeps her there, the great Queen and tender mother should rise up even in the grief of her own bereavement and England's loss and out of her own royal justice and discernment—already on many great occasions signally displayed, and never more signally than in America's hour of storm and stress—should give back this hapless and innocent young mother to the light of day and the sunshine of her childrens' faces!

God Save the Queen!

The prompt reply of Sir Henry Ponsonby was only to the effect that the Queen has no power to release a prisoner who has been tried and convicted, and that any application on any prisoner's behalf should be made to the Home Secretary.

The fund referred to in this letter was subscribed by American women and children to ascertain what if any further step could be taken in law for the rescue of their countrywoman, and was paid to the widely-known London solicitors, Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, by whom the sum that would be requisite had been named. They prepared a brief but impressive statement of the most important facts in the case, which they presented to counsel selected by themselves, and composed of such eminent lawyers and members of Parliament as Sir Charles Russell, Mr. J. Fletcher Moulton, Mr. Harry Bodkin Poland and Mr. Reginald J. Smith. Their consultations and deliberations were repeated

and prolonged through five months, but they were obliged to confess at last that the law of England has provided no way of escape for an innocent women doomed to imprisonment for life.

Their "Opinion" is in these words :

> Having carefully considered the facts stated in the elaborate case submitted to us by Messrs. Lumley & Lumley, and the law applicable to the matter, we are clearly of the opinion that there is no mode by which in this case a new trial or a *venire de novo* can be obtained, nor can the prisoner be brought up on a *habeas corpus* with a view to retrying the issue of her innocence or guilt.
>
> . . . We are of the opinion that in English criminal procedure there is no possibility of procuring a rehearing in the case of felony where a verdict has been found by a properly constituted jury, upon an indictment which is correct in form. This rule is in our opinion absolute, unless circumstances have transpired, and have been entered upon the record which, when there appearing, would invalidate the tribunal and reduce the trial to a nullity by reason of its not having been before a properly constituted tribunal. None of the matters proposed to be proved go to this length.
>
> We think it right to add that there are many matters stated in the case, not merely with reference to the evidence at, and the incidents of, the trial, but suggesting new facts, which would be matter proper for the grave consideration of a Court of Criminal Appeal if such a tribunal existed in this country.
>
> (Signed), C. Russell, J. Fletcher Moulton, Harry Bodkin Poland, Reginald J. Smith.
>
> Lincoln's Inn, April 12, 1892.

That the prisoner is innocent they were careful to imply in the concluding paragraph of their formal "opinion."

No stronger testimony is needed to the terrible defectiveness of the trial than this guarded statement.

There are *many* matters for appeal :

These matters refer to the *evidence* at the trial—the vital part of every trial :

These matters would be *proper* for the *grave consideration* of a court of appeal.

If there are many vital matters of evidence which need grave reconsideration, can they have been properly and adequately considered at the original trial ? Can there be stronger condemnation of the first trial than a decision that the matters which it left improperly and inadequately treated are many and vital ?

But the United States has no jurisdiction over England, and cannot create or re-create her laws. The decision of counsel was rendered at too late a day for effective presentation to Congress

at the present session. Recourse therefore was quickly had once more to the universal right of petition. Under the immediate inspection, suggestion, and revision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States a petition was prepared. The Supreme Court has indeed a singular interest in the prisoner, as I learned from themselves. The Chief Justice is connected with Mrs. Maybrick's family on the mother's side by marriage—remotely but nearly enough to have enlisted his close attention to her trial. His opinion I have not the right to give, and would not, lest, even through so unimportant and unofficial a channel, it might seem to be a judicial reflection in one country upon a judicial decision in another, and so prejudice still further her cause. Mr. Justice Lamar and the late Mr. Justice Campbell, both of the Supreme Court, are nearly akin by blood on the father's side to Mrs. Maybrick, and the opinion of Mr. Justice Lamar is as pronounced and as deliberate as that of the Chief Justice, but must be withheld for the same reasons. Of Mr. Justice Harlan, also a member of the Supreme Court and of the Behring Sea arbitration, the late Judge Campbell, the great uncle of Mrs. Maybrick, was an intimate friend, and his portrait presented by himself to Judge Harlan hangs in the latter's library. The warm, wide, large-hearted sympathy of Mr. Justice Field with the unhappy and the friendless, scarcely needs the stimulus of family and business association to which I have already referred.

The petition as forwarded was in these terms :

As Florence Ethel Maybrick is an American woman, without father, brother, husband, or kin in England, except two infant children, enduring penal servitude for life in Woking Prison;

As the conduct of her trial resulted in a profound impression of a miscarriage of justice, and an immediate and earnest protest against the verdict and against the execution of her sentence of death and in its commutation to penal servitude for life, on the ground of "reasonable doubt" whether a murder had been committed;

As a careful legal scrutiny of the evidence given at the trial, procured by American women and conducted by eminent English solicitors, barristers, Queen's counsel and members of Parliament, and the production of facts not in evidence at the trial, have resulted in a formal decision of counsel that the case is one proper for the grave consideration of a criminal appellate tribunal, if such a tribunal existed;

As no such tribunal exists;

As a bill is now pending in the House of Commons to establish a Court of Appeal in criminal cases, and as this bill is exactly applicable to Mrs. Maybrick's case, but can have no retrospective operation;

As Mrs. Maybrick's health is very delicate, she having been frequently in the infirmary of the prison, once from November to May, 1889-90, again from December to March, 1891-92; and as her family physician, Dr. MacGavin, 4 Rue St. Phillippe du Roule, Paris, officially advises Mrs. Maybrick's mother that "the strong tendency in her family to consumption, the confinement within the walls of a prison, together with the fearful mental depression incident to such a painful position, make it greatly to be feared that unless some change be speedily brought about, the same fate which befell her brother [death by rapid pulmonary consumption] will be that of Mrs. Maybrick";

Therefore we urgently ask that the Right Honorable Henry Matthews, Q. C., M. P., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, will advise Her Majesty to order the pardon and release of the prisoner, who has now suffered an imprisonment of nearly three years.

May 4, 1892.

This petition was signed by forty of the most representative names of the nation, including the Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; all the members of the cabinet; many chiefs of bureaus; the General commanding the army and several Brigadier Generals; Cardinal Gibbons, the highest authority of the Catholic Church in America, of whose communion are Mrs. Maybrick and her mother; the Minister to France; the Acting Judge Advocate-General; and others. Owing to the uncertainty—and the certainty—which had attended the petition of Mrs. Harrison, this petition was not laid before the President, so that he was not permitted the opportunity to sign it, but his countenance and assistance in the preparation and presentation of the previous petition—of which Your Majesty was respectfully informed—sufficiently indicate his sentiments.

The petition was not sent out to the sixty-five millions of the people of the United States because there was not time, in our great anxiety to hasten the restoration of the mother to her children, of the daughter to her mother; but the names signed are from all sections and from no sections, from all parties and all churches. Mrs. Maybrick, in her sufferings, as in her blood, unites the North and the South, the Democrat and the Republican, the old slaveholder, the old abolitionist, and the new nation which embraces both; the old Confederate, the old Unionist, and the new American, who knows but one flag.

To-day comes the answer to the petition from Lord Salisbury:

"Taking the most lenient view which the facts proved in evidence, and known to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, admit of, the case of this convict

was that of an adulteress attempting to poison her husband, under the most cruel circumstances, while she pretended to be nursing him on his sick bed.

"The Secretary of State regrets that he has been unable to find any ground for recommending to the Queen any further act of clemency towards the prisoner."

It is my purpose now to call Your Majesty's attention to this response to the American petition, only in point of its bearing upon the question of international amenity and amity.

As a just woman, whom God, through the laws of your country, has appointed Queen of England, I call Your Majesty to witness that Mrs. Osborne, an English woman of high connections, of great wealth, after the perpetration of a grave crime, persisted in, with complications that render it incredibly malignant, and confessed only when exposure was inevitable, received sentence of only a few months' imprisonment, and was pardoned after a few weeks of incarceration. We in America rejoice in this exercise of your royal clemency, believing that unfortunate woman to be in a measure irresponsible, and believing that the ends of justice have been fully answered.

Mrs. Montagu, also an English subject of wealth and high connections, confessedly and undeniably guilty of a crime so monstrous that it might be said in all Christendom

"Was no mother,
But spat towards her and hissed;
No child, but screamed out curses
And shook its little fist."

—guilty of the slaughter of her helpless infant through hours of torture—was sentenced to an imprisonment of but one year.

Alfred Rubery, convicted in the United States on abundant and undenied evidence of an attempt on vast property and many lives, "under the most cruel circumstances," at a time when men's minds were in a state of high excitement, and life and property in great peril through civil war, was promptly pardoned by the President of the United States at the first asking of one prominent Englishman, "as a mark of respect and good will" to him.

Mrs. Maybrick, of eminent family, but poor and an American, convicted under a judge then probably, and soon after certainly, stricken with mental disease, so that he was forced by public opinion to resign from the bench; convicted on a trial so imperfect that a council of English lawyers and

members of Parliament certify to its insufficiency, and the Secretary of State reverses its verdict; languishing in life-long imprisonment under a charge of attempt to murder, for which she was never indicted, tried, or convicted except by the Home Secretary in the seclusion of his own department, and under the implication of adultery, for which she was never indicted or tried, and which was never proved beyond the assertion that it is "known to the Home Secretary," and which, if proved, is not punishable under the English law with imprisonment for life;—this American woman is immured in Woking Prison, and, to the agonized entreaties of her mother, to the tender urgency of the wife of the President of the United States, to the respectful petition of the most eminent men of this country, the English government, in a time of profound peace, makes answer:

The convict is an adulteress who attempted to poison her husband. She shall die in her prison!

We cannot yet believe that this voice is the voice of Victoria —the gentle, friendly, yet just and commanding voice that won our hearts in all the din and tumult of war. I intrust this letter to the public as the lover flings his note over the garden wall that guards his lady's bower, hoping that some kind breeze may waft it to the beloved feet;—and we may find our Queen again.

But if, indeed, a mockery must be; if great kings must courtesy to nice customs; if your Majesty must be set upon the mercy-seat before all England and the world, yet be forbidden to show mercy, I beg to offer you the homage of a profound regret.

GAIL HAMILTON.

ERRATIC PLATFORMS OF THE DEMOCRACY.

BY THE HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM VERMONT.

In every age, where liberty and human progress have made notable advances, there comes a time when a brood of stragglers in the rear appear to denounce the progress made as nothing worth, and to demand the restoration of the Bourbons with all of the conditions which once restricted the greater part of mankind to less of freedom, to less of the comforts of life, and to less of intellectual individuality, but which gave to a stupid aristocracy political supremacy. Against such progress the United States has heretofore had its recalcitrants, its Silver-greys, its Copperheads, and now its Mugwumps.

Denied all protection by our British ancestors, the several States at the close of the War of Independence surrendered to the nation the sole power to protect domestic industries by a tariff on imports of foreign merchandise, and the logical result appears in the foremost act of Congress, July 4, 1789, under President Washington, as follows :

"Whereas it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

This tariff act, the earliest of our fathers', admitted not only teas but all imported merchandise at a less rate of duty if imported in ships built and owned by citizens of the United States. It also imposed a specific and protective duty on cotton of three cents per pound, and authorized bounties to be paid on dried and pickled fish and on salted provisions when exported. This was the decisive way in which the gifted framers of the constitution practically administered it. The whole scope of the act, untrammeled by the mother country, clearly announced an American policy, and determined that our country should not become the mere "pasturage for the progeny of foreign kine."

The Republican platform adopted by the Congressional caucus in 1800—and the Democratic party still claim that it then bore the name of Republican—contained as one of its planks the following :

"Encouragement of science and the arts in all their branches, to the end that the American people may perfect their independence of all foreign monopolies, institutions, and influences."

Democratic Mr. Dallas, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his report on the protective tariff of 1816, stated what was true then and equally true to-day, that:

"There are few if any governments which do not regard the establishment of domestic manufactures as a chief object of public policy. The United States have always so regarded it."

The tariff received every vote in the Senate except five, and three of the five were from New England. In the House of Representatives the bill was championed by Mr. Calhoun, who said : " Gentlemen ought not to give in to the contracted idea that taxes were so much money taken from the people ; properly applied, the money proceeding from taxes was money put out to the best possible interest for the people." The " contracted ideas " of Mr. Cleveland certainly need instruction, if not the birch rod of the schoolmaster.

The protective-tariff bill presented March 4, 1828, by Rollin C. Mallory, of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, was accompanied by a report written by that eminent Democrat, Silas Wright, Jr., of New York. This bill, while the majority of both Houses of Congress was Democratic, contained specific, compound, square yard, and minimum duties, and all the grim features that are now so wont to set the teeth of Free-traders on edge, received in the Senate the votes of such distinguished Jacksonian Democrats as James K. Polk, Dutee J. Pearce, Martin Van Buren, James Buchanan, Silas Wright, Jr., Joel Yancey, Thomas H. Benton and Richard M. Johnson. Three of these distinguished men were subsequently elected to the Presidency by the Democratic party. Assuredly Van Buren, Buchanan, Wright, and Benton were not densely ignorant of practical political economy, nor of the constitutional doctrines of their party, but to-day they would have to retire as heretics and give place to those known as Democrats only because they say so and subscribe to the latest Chicago platform.

In 1840 the Democratic National Platform set forth :

"That the constitution does not confer upon the general government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvements."

The immense subsidies of land to the Illinois Central and other railroads were granted under the lead of Mr. Douglas a few years later. They also then tolerated "differences of opinion," and therefore resolved not to nominate any one for Vice-President on the ticket with Mr. Van Buren, but there was not a word about the tariff.

In 1844 their platform favored "the reoccupation of Oregon and the annexation of Texas," with nothing about the tariff.

From 1789 to 1828 Democrats and Federalists, however widely apart on some other questions, practically agreed on the protection of home products. With such Southern statesmen long in the lead as Jefferson and Madison, Jackson and Benton, Clay and Calhoun, a tariff for home protection, as well as for revenue, was authoritatively fixed as the paramount and permanent American policy. If there had been any doubt in 1789 that this would not become our future national policy, it is not too much to say that the State-protection policy then practically prevailing would not have been surrendered, and our constitution could not have been ratified by the several States.

The Calhoun era of secession and nullification finally constrained the Democratic party to adopt the partisan tariff of 1846. This tariff put the same rate of duty on pig-iron and scrap-iron as upon manufactures of iron, steel, gold, or silver ; the same upon wool as upon Turkey and Wilton carpets, and more upon firewood, sugar, and molasses than upon manufactures of silk. These are only specimen bricks of the Walker tariff, which, after being horizontally amended in 1857, failed to give either protection or revenue sufficient for the ordinary support of the government. From 1847 to 1857 our imports, exclusive of specie, exceeded our exports by $313,073,805, and the excess of our exports of specie amounted to $258,853,228.

The tariff of 1861 was made largely specific and consequently more steadily protective. The compound duties on woollens by weight and ad valorem were there first introduced as compensatory to protective duties on wool, and, as far as possible, higher duties were imposed upon luxuries than upon articles of general

consumption. It also largely increased the number of articles on the free list.

This tariff, it may not be too much to say, contained the vertebræ upon which have been built all the subsequent protective-tariff statutes. The expense of the War of the Rebellion and its prodigious legacy of public debt, made a vast increase of revenue a public necessity. The rates of duty had to be increased because the protective home industries soon began to reduce prices and to limit the extent of imported articles from which revenue was obtainable. The increase of our population was wondrously large, notwithstanding the sore losses in the conflict of the Rebellion, but an annual revenue of sixty or seventy-five million dollars, once very adequate, suddenly had to be quadrupled. If this is now a burden it is a burden imposed by the unpatriotic Confederate action of those who now, perhaps, complain the most and bear the smallest share of it. Unquestionably the Free-traders of Southern States, on account of their far milder climate and their six million of colored citizens, contribute only a small share comparatively of tariff revenue, as they consume of dutiable foreign merchandise but a small part of what would be their due proportion according to their representative population.

For nearly sixty years of the republic a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, was firmly established, and so revered by our fathers, and especially by the Democratic party, that no murmur was raised against it in any quarter, save by the "Nullifiers" of South Carolina, the chief of whom President Jackson wanted to hang. But modern Democracy has so lapsed and degenerated from its ancient opinions and principles that it is now ready to accept the doctrine of the rebel Confederate constitution in its national tariff platform, or the ideas and trickery of Tammany pettifoggers, if only the victors are baited with the promise of the spoils of office. That it may be seen whether or not this is unfounded criticism, it may be well to further resurrect some of these Democratic platforms, not long dead, but so tainted that it may be well for any old and time-honored Democrat either to shun them or to hold his nose.

In 1852 their platform announced:

"That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles in the Kentucky and Virginia resolution of 1798 and 1799."

Some sly objections also against protection began to peep out,

> "Like the toes of some maiden's shoes
> Beneath a mass of furbelows,"

and were presented as follows :

"That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other."

There is no instance where any such detriment has been done by a protective tariff. On the contrary, the whole American continent is decorated with the monuments of its blessings. Fostering manufactures cannot fail to benefit all branches of industry, and especially of agriculture, by the creation of more consumers of agricultural and other products.

In 1856 their platform once more abided by the resolutions of 1798, and it was resolved :

" That it is time to declare for free seas and for progressive free trade throughout the world."

Progressive free trade is throughout the world still a barren theory, everywhere practically on the retrograde, with many grumblers even in its British and only home, and not favored by any progressive European democrat, but in 1856 the Democratic platform makers here, possibly when half seas over, indulged in the foregoing brief and silly flirtation with free trade.

In 1860 the platform of both the Breckinridge and Douglas wings of the party, repeated the tariff resolution of 1856, and favored aid to a Pacific railroad. The party has twice been in favor of large land grants to railroads and twice against them. Both wings of the party flopped together in 1860 on the following resolution :

"That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of Cuba on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain."

They again flirted with the tariff, but, as ever, very earnestly sought to give slavery greater chances of extension in our territories.

In 1864 the Democratic platform, with no mention of the tariff, showed the white feather and declared that, "after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war," they demanded " that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities." Their candidate for the Presidency, Gen. McClellan, spat upon the platform, and all but three of the States appear to have expectorated on both platform and candidate.

In 1868 their platform demanded "the payment of the public debt as rapidly as practicable," and when not otherwise expressed, that it should "be paid in lawful money of the United States," that is to say, "greenbacks." In the sixth resolution of their platform, "incidental protection to domestic manufactures" was demanded, but it was to be derived from the internal revenue laws. This dubious way of gathering grapes from thorns and figs from thistles was seriously proposed as follows:

"A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under internal revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will without impairing the revenue impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country."

This hybrid protection of the domestic manufactures of iron, wool, and cotton by an internal revenue tax upon the domestic production of whiskey and tobacco was a Democratic discovery, but a dull world failed to see that it indicated anything more than the prepotency of some platform ass.

In 1872 the Democratic National platform contained the following words:

"That there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective system of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in the congressional districts and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation."

The straight-out Democratic National platform at Louisville in 1872 would not indorse Horace Greeley for the Presidency, but not from hostility to any protective doctrine, as the following resolution will show:

"Resolved, that the interests of labor and capital should not be permitted to conflict, but should be harmonized by judicious legislation. While such a conflict continues, labor, which is the parent of wealth, is entitled to paramount consideration."

In 1876 the National Democratic platform demanded "a tariff for revenue only," and in 1880 the important change made read as follows: "We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue," and the difference was as lucid as that between "an old cocked-up hat" and "a cocked-up old hat," but, as the learned author insisted, they were synonymous, and must both be interpreted the same as British free trade. But the very next Democratic Convention incontinently unloaded its free-trade

synonyms of 1876 and 1880, and, though rather sullenly, straddled back to the doctrine of moderate protection.

In 1884 the Democratic National platform, after the usual vituperative denunciation of Republicans, and a pledge to reduce the revenue to the lowest limit, contained the following:

"Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsible to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. . . . Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. . . . The necessary reductions in taxation can and must be affected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country."

These elaborate and fair promises, made perhaps only to deceive Democrats and laborers who favored protection, beyond doubt had their effect, and Mr. Cleveland thus obtained the Presidency.

In 1888 the Democratic National platform on the tariff was more compact but not less emphatic for the protection of American labor, and sought popular support in the following words:

"Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not, and need not, be endangered by a reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference of the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operation."

These lamb-like phrases failed to hide the wolf which had been uncovered by the proposals of a Democratic House of Representatives, as well as by the free-trade message of the Democratic President in 1887, and Mr. Cleveland was defeated in the election of 1888.

The Democratic National platform of 1892, as finally amended, no longer concealed the purpose of adopting British free trade to its utmost limit, not only promising to repeal the McKinley tariff, but reckless of all prior protection assurances, promulgates the latest revision of its tariff creed as follows:

"We denounce the Republican protective tariff as a fraud upon the labor of the great majority of American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal goverment has not constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the government when honestly and economically administered."

This cuts up all protection at the roots by the denial of constitutional powers to cover any idea but that of raising revenue, and would force the imposition of very high duties on sugar, teas, and coffee, that we do not and cannot produce, and very low duties on all manufactures that we can produce, in order to obtain sufficient revenue by giving up the American market to an enormous increase in the importation of foreign manufactures. So much of the party as were at Chicago suddenly swears eternal friendship to principles that admit of no modification, "for the enforcement and supremacy of which," Mr. Cleveland has declared, "all who have any right to claim Democratic fellowship must constantly and persistently labor."

If there was a shadow of doubt, as there is not, about the meaning of the present Democratic tariff platform, it would vanish upon sight of what was originally proposed and rejected to give place to the aforesaid final amendment. Their Committee had proposed to run the campaign of 1892 on the moderately protective platform of 1884, which professed to be regardful of both labor and capital, especially of the difference in cost of American and foreign labor, and not to injure domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. All this and more was suddenly stricken out and clearly demonstrates that it is the purpose now to bolt and rivet the Democratic party to the British doctrine of free trade, which Great Britain maintains solely for the purpose of keeping down the wages of British laborers to the lowest point, in order to obtain an overpowering export trade in competition with foreign nations, by which to get food for more than half of its population.

Even if the Democratic party should fail now to win, with the voters of one or two Northern States combined with a "solid South," and flop back in 1896 to the platitudes in behalf of home industries, it could not then be trusted. Much less can it be trusted now that it hoists the black flag and wages a war of absolute extermination against any and all tariff protection. The

issue tendered is that labor must take care of itself, and that capital must seek for protection in other countries.

For the last forty years the Democratic party platforms might have been properly advertised, like dramatic star actors, "to appear for this time only." They have long ceased to represent any abiding principle, and merely point, as may a wooden rooster on some barn, to the shifting currents of the wind.

For the past generation the melancholy history of the party has been so equivocal and desperate, and the platform botchery of its leaders so sterile of popular favor, that they are now ready to renounce all former pretensions of love for the men of home industries, as well as all regard for the general welfare of our native land. They would even offer unconditional free trade to our great British rival rather than reciprocity to the South American republics.

The Democratic party of the North purchases its alliance with the "Solid South" by the surrender of all protection to American industries and a tame submission to the precise terms of the late loved and lost Confederate constitution, which, after the grant of the power to lay and collect taxes and duties, concludes as follows:

"But no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry."

It is unnecessary to say that this Confederate prohibition, or anything like it, is not to be found in the constitution of the United States, and yet the Democratic party is now pledged to enforce and give it practical validity throughout the Union, though it is merely a free-trade ghost supposed to haunt the original Confederate States, where it once found an unhonored grave.

The erratic and contradictory declarations of National Democratic conventions on paper money, on internal improvements, and other subjects than the tariff, have long been conspicuous. For example, their convention in 1888 resolved as follows:

"That the territories of Washington, Dakota, Montana, and New Mexico are by virtue of population and development entitled to admission into the Union as States, and we unqualifiedly condemn the course of the Republican party in refusing statehood and self-government to their people."

And yet when the Republicans admitted to statehood four ter-

ritories in 1890, their admission was resisted and loud protestations came forth from Democrats that it was only Republican partisanship that conceived or consented to the policy, and not that the territories were entitled to admission.

The progenitors of the Democratic free-trade platforms, twelve and sixteen years ago, which led to the disastrous miscarriage of the party, do not appear to have learned any wisdom at the late Chicago Convention, and now seem to rejoice at again beholding the swelling front of the Democratic party suddenly pregnant with free trade. It was enough for their platform-makers to know that the party in power, the Republican party, supported the ancient Democratic doctrine of "a tariff for revenue with incidental protection," to arouse suspicion that it was all wrong and not Democratic. It was as clear that Republicans favored protection, as it was that Democrats formerly favored it, and that was enough to excite ever present partisan hostility to the principle of a protective tariff, forgetful that there were among our citizens millions of Democratic protectionists, and forgetful that they were assailing the character of statesmen who gave the Democratic party its earliest and greatest renown.

When Mr. Cleveland was defeated for the Presidency in 1888, it was often said by many of his Democratic supporters that his free-trade hobby, which he mounted in 1887, ran away with him. It has been asserted, also, that he became reluctant to again ride his balky steed, and proposed at the Chicago convention to mount in 1892 a much tamer and slower going Rozinante, but the Tammany braves and Hill Democrats—who had vociferously declared that Cleveland, if nominated, could not be elected—refused to further depreciate his political horsemanship, and therefore insisted in their platform upon again mounting him upon the same sore-backed free-trade hobby, apparently not caring a dime whether it should again run away with the jockey or not.

The Democratic leaders were obviously ready to enlist under any banner, Christian or Moslem, that was most distasteful to the faction that would not consent to the nomination of Mr. Hill. In the nomination of Mr. Cleveland their forlorn hope is to retain the support of the political dilettanti, best known as the Mugwumps, who were once successfully baited with "revenue reform," and believed to be now too lazy and gouty to escape the free-trade trap.

But Mr. Cleveland, when accepting the nomination in his speech, July 20th, appeared unready to accept that portion of the party platform which declares that the "government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only," and made his prompt dissent about so attacking "tariff laws" as follows:

"We need not base our attack upon questions of constitutional permission or legislative power."

The vituperative fertility shown, however, in high-seasoned commentaries on the theory of tariff protection will no doubt satisfy even free-trade Hotspurs that no one of them can lead where Mr. Cleveland will not follow. It may be true that he once committed himself against being a Presidential candidate for the second time, but evidently not against a third time. He will no doubt be equally adroit in adhering to his convictions on the tariff question.

For a whole century the American encouragement of the mechanical arts and manufactures has generally prevailed. This encouragement has absorbed in fixed investments the greater part of the surplus capital of the country. Outside of those engaged in agriculture, it has given remunerative employment to the largest number of American workingmen, skilled and life-trained in the arts and manufactures, and whose products surpass in annual amount those of any other people.

The Democratic party proposes that all this shall be suddenly changed and have no consideration. The issue they tender in the coming national contest is, that American capital and American labor shall have no more protection than foreign capital and foreign labor. If Americans will not work as cheaply as foreign artisans, they must hold the plow and hoe, and no longer fraternize with steam engines, but banish from their home all the labor-saving machinery to which they have given birth and for which they have the highest aptitudes.

For the past ten years it is believed that twenty-five million dollars have been annually taken from Northern States and invested in manufactures in the so-called "New South." The Democratic policy of free trade would confiscate all such irremovable investments as remorselessly as those of earlier birth and of infinitely greater magnitude in Northern and Western States, and

as entitled by the free-trade creed to no better treatment than that of aliens and enemies.

Laboring men may be told, as they were last year told by Mr. Gladstone, that we should not have "mills and factories to produce yarn and cloth which could be had cheaper abroad," but this would compel the great multitude now employed in "mills and factories" to change their vocation to that of increasing the crops of cotton, corn and wheat, reducing the prices of such crops for the benefit of foreign purchasers.

Free trade builds up a few great importing cities on the sea shore, and creates millionaires in foreign trade. It depopulates the rural districts, and has nothing but lip-service to offer those who toil for their daily bread. It would give to the latter the dearer cost of living and the 77 per cent. less of wages which free trade in England offers to those who labor. It already rejoices at every calamity which grieves home industries, and would make our imports always to exceed our exports, keep us always in debt and always poor.

Republicans believe that our government should have great and noble purposes, beyond the mere power to levy and collect taxes. They also hold that every heartbeat of political parties should be in harmony with the hum of diversified and universal industry, and that the political parties should contribute by their patriotism, faith, and good works to make our country great and prosperous—great in its political institutions, great in the wealth of its intellectual, moral and material achievements.

JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

THE TARIFF PLANK AT CHICAGO.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

BEFORE examining its latest declaration on the tariff question, it may be well to review the utterances of the Democratic party in prior national conventions. The keynote of its whole platform in 1876 was Reform, and among the urgent reforms called for was reform "in the sum and modes of federal taxation." It denounced, in detail, the existing law as "a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretence," and set forth its own doctrine in these words:

"We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

In 1880 the party pledged itself anew to its "constitutional doctrines and traditions," among which it put "a tariff for revenue only."

These declarations were not made in the face of an enemy, for the tariff was not an issue in these elections until the closing weeks of the campaign of 1880, when the Republicans suddenly brought it forward in the manufacturing districts of the country, to the surprise and somewhat to the confusion of their adversaries.

By 1884, however, the situation had changed. The somewhat non-partizan attempt to secure a revision of the tariff in 1882 by a Tariff Commission had been thwarted by the success of the protected industries in capturing the Commission, and the bill which they extorted from a dying and discredited Republican Congress, March 3, 1883, had not reduced the surplus or lightened the burdens of the taxpayer. Accordingly, when the Forty-eighth Congress met, in December, 1883, those who favored a vigorous continuance of the fight for Tariff Reform controlled the Democratic caucus and organized the House with Mr. Carlisle as Speaker. But the caucus could not swing the party vote behind the Morrison Bill, and the defeat of that bill, through a division in the ranks, carried the controversy into the national convention.

The platform which, after a long and arduous struggle,

emerged from the Committee on Resolutions, and was adopted by the convention of 1884 was not so much "a straddle" as a piece of ill-joined patchwork, the work of many hands.

It demanded that "federal taxation should be exclusively for public purposes," but "subject" to certain specified "limitations." The most noteworthy of these "limitations" were: The party pledged itself to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests; that in reducing taxes it was not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but to promote their hearty growth; that custom-house taxes must remain, as from the foundation of the government they have been, the chief source of revenue; that as many industries have come to rely on legislation for their successful continuance, any change of law must be, at every step, regardful of the labor and capital thus involved; that necessary reduction of taxes must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates than would be ample to cover any increased cost of production due to the higher wages of our labor; that sufficient revenue could be had from custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and lightest on articles of necessity.

This platform showed division, not unity, in the party. It was an attempt to bridge a chasm, not to close it.

The clear-cut and explicit declaration of 1876 and 1880 in favor of tariffs for revenue only was smothered under a superincumbent mass of so-called "limitations." But these "limitations" were, in the main, merely pledges as to the *method* of reducing taxes and promises as to its *effect*, with a concession to the fears of the labor vote which was still clinging to the skirts of protection. Such a platform, the best attainable at the time with party harmony, could not unite the party's representatives for actual work, and the second Morrison Bill, even with the favor of a Democratic administration, met the fate of the first. But the work of unification was going on, and Mr. Cleveland's message of 1887 made Tariff Reform the party issue. The Mills Bill was passed by a practically full party vote, in a House having a meagre Democratic majority, as compared with the Houses that killed the Morrison Bill. The national convention of 1888, in renominating Mr. Cleveland, adopted the tariff resolution of 1884, as interpreted by his message, and approved the Mills Bill.

The campaign of education went on, nothing checked by Mr. Cleveland's defeat, and received an immense impetus from the McKinley Bill of 1890.

When the recent convention met at Chicago, the representatives of the Democratic party were united and zealous in their devotion to tariff reform, and full of the confidence born of many victories freshly won under its banner. They expected a clear and courageous statement of fundamental party principle and of the party's attitude to existing laws. The resolution as reported by the committee left nothing to be desired on the latter head, but instead of the former contained a preliminary paragraph or two, in which, with much that was admirable, appeared some of the familiar but now unsatisfactory phrases of the make-shift of 1884. The convention, with very slight protest from the Committee on Platform, took the risk of striking out these phrases and their setting and of inserting in place of them a clear declaration of fundamental party doctrine. The inserted words are :

> We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the government honestly and economically administered.

This is no new doctrine. It is a return to the frank and explicit declaration of 1876 and 1880, showing that the party is now ready to avow in the thick of battle what it then avowed before the combat opened.

The Democratic party has always maintained the principle that the power to impose and collect taxes in aid of any private enterprise is beyond the scope of legislation, and does not pass, under free government, even with the general grant of legislative power. This doctrine has been upheld, in a long series of decisions in the State and Federal courts, when efforts have been made to use the taxing power in the States for other than public or revenue purposes. The principle is the same when Congress undertakes to "impose and collect tariff duties" in aid of private enterprise or for the support of special industries, but there is no way in which the question can be raised, for the law imposing them always appears on its face to be a law to raise revenue, and courts cannot inquire into the motives of Congress in passing

it. Even Mr. Randall, in his speech in the House, in 1882, on the Tariff Commission Bill, said :

> "I do not favor a tariff enacted on the ground of protection for the sake of protection, because I doubt the existence of any constitutional warrant for any such construction, or the grant of any such power."

The denial of the right of the federal government to "impose and collect" tariff duties for the sake of protection is merely saying in a different form of words that under a government of equal rights there can be no class legislation. It is, therefore, in effect, but a re-statement of the position taken by the party in 1876 and in 1880, and it does not necessarily imply any radical departure from the methods of tariff reduction, to which it was deemed best to give more prominence in 1884, than to the great principle that demanded such reduction.

There is need for little comment upon the paragraphs of the report of the committee which were stricken out in convention. They were no longer aids, but incumbrances in the fight. The temper and the courage of the party are mightily different in 1892 from what they were in 1884 ; what was necessary prudence then would be cowardice now. The convention responded fully and heartily to the feeling of the party it represented. It showed its confidence in tariff reform as the great and winning issue by its nomination of Mr. Cleveland in the face of warnings that would have driven it from a man who did not also stand for a cause. It meant that there should be nothing ambiguous about the party's attitude to that cause, and that the statement of its fundamental principle should not be overlaid with cumulative limitations. And in all this the convention was right. We have passed that stage in the great tariff controversy where it is necessary or proper to cumber party platforms with limitations and promises and protests. After the Mills Bill and the special bills passed by the present House, it is superfluous to assure the people that the Democratic party will proceed carefully and conservatively in reducing the tariff. In dealing with this as with every other long-standing abuse interwoven with our social or industrial system, the statesman will always remember that in the beginning temperate reform is safest, having in it the principle of growth.

In view of the immense increase in our annual expenditures, and the steady swelling of our pension list, it is equally unnecessary to repeat that taxes collected at the custom house must re-

main the chief source of our revenue. Ease and simplicity of collection will always give a preference to indirect taxes collected through a tariff of duties on imported articles. Such taxes are gathered at a few great seaports, and being incorporated with the price of the goods, as they enter the country, are finally paid by the consumers of those goods, as they buy them, from time to time. Instead of an army of federal taxgatherers swarming the country and gathering directly from the people, the government has a limited number of employees massed in a few custom houses. Instead of paying his entire tax bill at one time, the taxpayer pays his taxes by instalments scattered through his year's purchases. But in these very advantages lurk all the abuses of a hidden system of taxation, which, without constant vigilance, are sure to turn a tariff from being a convenient method of getting public revenue into a scheme of private emolument, such as we have in the McKinley Bill to-day. The power of the government to tax an article for revenue is seized by the private interest to tax a competitor out of the market, or to handicap him in his efforts to compete in the market.

A system of direct taxation would effectually check such extravagance as led to the Billion-Dollar Congress, and would prevent that partnership between the government and great private interests that is rife with political scandals and with unjust burdens to the people. But such a system was doubtless impracticable in the beginning and seems scarcely less so now. We are called upon as the urgent duty of the hour, and of all time, to guard against the perversion of our tariff system that has ripened into the McKinley Bill. From the wrongs that now oppress us under that bill, we must work back as rapidly as we can to a system where duties will be levied for purposes of revenue only, and, having reached that reform, we shall in due time so amend our tariff system as to purge it more and more of private extortion and of inequality of burden.

Nor can the Democratic party any longer derive strength from pandering to the delusion that protective duties can in any way directly benefit labor. The intelligent laboring man, whose vote is his own, knows better perhaps than any other man, for he knows by experience, that a protective tariff is a question of the "enhancement of the profits of capital," not of the "increase of the wages of labor which would reduce those profits."

The great battle seems so nearly won, if we look back at the unbroken series of victories since 1888, that we need not concern ourselves about methods and "limitations," but in the bold and honest statement of the fundamental position of our party may look henceforward for strength and for final triumph.

It is not necessary that I should review those paragraphs of the tariff plank which denounce the existing law and direct attention to the effects of "thirty years' restrictive taxes" upon the prosperity of agriculture, but I cannot refrain from saying, that there has been no juster statement of the sham reciprocity of the McKinley Bill than that contained in the section which may be called a part of the tariff plank of the Chicago platform.

In conclusion, as bearing upon the general subject, I would refer to "Two Congresses Contrasted," by ex-Speaker Reed, in the last number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, in which he says of the present Congress: "The Democracy in the House, with a force of three to one, have not only done nothing with the tariff, but they have done nothing with anything else. Not one measure above the dignity of rye straw will mark the annals of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress."

It is perfectly natural that Mr. Reed should feel it his mission in life to vindicate the memory of the last House and its rules, and to contend that it fell a martyr to the blind wrath of the people, not a victim to their discriminating anger. No one will contest his right to speak for it living or dead, just as the senior member of the great firm of Snitchley & Craggs always spoke "for self and Craggs," and, after the death of his partner, "for self and Craggs deceased."

But it seems almost incredible that Mr. Reed, not as ex-Speaker and perpetual champion of the last House, but as member of the Committee of Ways and Means of the present House, should have so completely forgotten recent events as to affirm that the "Democracy have done nothing with the tariff." That committee, at the opening of the present Congress, for reasons that satisfied a majority of its Democratic members, decided to attack the tariff by a series of single bills rather than by a general revision. In executing this plan the committee, or members of it, framed and carried through the House six tariff bills, as follows: Putting wool on the free list and reducing duties on woolen goods; putting binding twine on the free list; removing duties

from cotton ties, cotton bagging, and machinery for making cotton bagging; putting tin plate on the free list; admitting free of duty silver lead ores, and limiting the amount of wearing apparel that may be brought in free of duty.

These bills, as they were successively sent to the Senate, were all pigeonholed by its Committee on Finance; otherwise more bills of like character would have followed them. But in themselves they are a great and substantial contribution to Tariff Reform and show the fidelity of a Democratic House to its pledges, although powerless to carry its measures into laws because of a Republican Senate and Executive.

The Wool and Woollen Bill alone is a very great measure of Tariff Reform. It deals with the worst tax in the whole schedule, and if made a law, would mean cheaper, better and more abundant clothing to every man, woman and child in the country, with more employment to American workingmen to make that clothing, as also to make carpets and other woollen fabrics. No tariff bill could have been prepared more beneficent in its purpose or more universal in its relief. So is the Tin-Plate Bill a great and substantial measure, fostering many industries, and benefitting the canners and consumers of canned goods.

Indeed, Mr. Reed is estopped from saying that the present House has "done nothing with the tariff," for he and his associates of the minority declared over their own signatures, as these bills were successively reported from the committee, that they would cripple agriculture, destroy manufactures, rob American labor of employment, and generally bring untold disasters upon the country. Of the very least of them all, he said over his own signature, that "the removal of the duty would throw thousands of men out of employment, rendering millions of capital useless, and turning $2,000,000 annually to the laborers of other countries." If one small bill to put binding twine on the free list is to produce such tremendous results, what language can adequately portray the effects of all six bills? And how can Mr. Reed now say that the depraved Democracy, that tried to turn loose these dire plagues upon us, have "done nothing with the tariff"?

Truly, it looks as if the ruin of his country and the irreparable overthrow of American industries only momentarily diverted him from his great life-work of eulogizing "self and Craggs, deceased"!

WM. L. WILSON.

INNOCENCE VERSUS IGNORANCE.

BY AMÉLIE RIVES.

It seems hardly possible to open this subject, without at first becoming involved in a statement of axioms; for, on reflecting that Ignorance means a want of knowledge, and Innocence, freedom from guilt, purity, this thought at once presents itself —that, while a person, wanting in knowledge, may often be innocent, the very lack of knowledge may as often lead him into guilt.

And, conversely, that while another, thoroughly instructed in what guilt means, may of his free will indulge in, or refrain from, wrong-doing, the fact of such knowledge on his part, in no way affects the innocence of his nature, or actions, when according to his ideas of right and wrong he has done what he considers to be right.

Much has been written during the past two or three years upon this question, especially as it touches the moral education of young girls, and their relations to society at large, and domestic life in particular. There has been urged the desirability of the old system of maintaining certain kinds of ignorance, even at the expense of culture, and that knowledge of human affairs, without which human beings cannot be justly expected to fulfil worthily their duty to their fellow-creatures, whether that term be applied to their immediate family, or to that public with which necessarily they are directly, or indirectly, connected.

I must confess that my views on the subject are tersely stated in the following line by Browning:—

"Ignorance is not innocence, but sin."

No one will deny that an intelligent bystander would be culpable in allowing any one to grasp a non-insulated electric-wire in his bare hand, from a lack of knowledge which such an onlooker

could supply; and yet people question the wisdom of instructing children and young girls in regard to moral matters, far more serious, where an admired ignorance might, indeed often does, lead them into permanently injuring themselves, both mentally and physically.

That the curiosity of childhood is both a natural and admirable trait seems a statement hardly likely to be disputed, and yet we not only find that it is disputed by many, but that such a view is nearly always condemned as lax and erroneous. Who has not heard some eager, intelligent child ask questions on religious or physical subjects which were at once hushed and reproved as "Naughty," "Disrespectful to God," "Not nice," "Things about which little boys and girls must not even think, much less ask questions." The child thus repulsed goes away to ponder these things in its own heart, or to discuss them with its playmates, who, in nine cases out of ten, fill its mind with the most distorted medley of approximate facts, which, conceding that the nature is a high one, overwhelms it with a miserable perplexity, or, as often unfortunately happens, rouses in it a morbid desire to hear more statements of a like character, and develops in it that form of corrupt taste which results in the hypocrisy and deceit of peeping into books which it knows would be forbidden by its superiors.

Not only have I thought constantly and deeply on this subject for many years, but I have had during that time intimate and affectionate relations with many children, both boys and girls, of widely varied natures; and the conclusion at which I have arrived is that this natural curiosity of growing minds in regard to all subjects should be met by older people with a wise and judicious tolerance, and satisfied by a disclosure of as much of what is the truth, as the grown person in question thinks the child capable of comprehending.

Any questioning of religion is, as a rule, treated by the same hush-do n't-be-naughty system. A little girl whom I know once asked her mother this sufficiently puzzling question, "Mother, dear, our Lord said to the poor thief, 'this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,' and then went down to hell for three days. Now, please explain to me how that was?" A friend suggested that "a thousand years with the Lord were as one day," and the child contented herself with this answer, whereas if her

question had been waived in the usual manner, it would probably have led to that religious brooding from which children so often suffer.

Of course, in the moral education of young girls, due reference should be had to their characteristics both of body and mind. Some intellects can digest and benefit by knowledge which would only burden and disturb those less strong, or those which are unduly excitable and imaginative. That which, according to my views, should be avoided, is a system of training from which all instruction, or at least all clear instruction, as to the rules of health and life, has been rigorously eliminated. A knowledge of the laws which govern physical nature seems to me not only the right of every thinking being, but the only means by which people will ever be brought to look simply, wisely, and innocently at certain fundamental facts, upon which rests the whole structure of existence.

"Will there never be a time when every mother will be the priestess of her children and family?" are words put into the mouth of Milton by Walter Savage Landor. "Our duties are simple and learnt easily. No sunrise but awakens one or the other of them into activity and growth. Boys are educated, girls are not; yet girls should be educated first and taught the most impressively. These slender graceful columns are not only the ornament but also the support of society. Men are the braver for the reverence they bear towards them, and in them do they find their reward."

There is no time in her life when an intelligent and thoroughly instructed young girl cannot be an aid and inspiration to all those who feel the need of her sympathy. Her brothers will confide in her, as they never would were she the morally one-sided and ignorant being instanced by some people as the only type of the refined and innocent maiden, and they will draw from her a strength and incentive to all high aims, and be illuminated by the light of a purity which shines, not through the opaque medium of ignorance, but through the clear texture of that lofty innocence which is the choice of what is worthy, made by one having the knowledge of good and evil.

However, the ignorance of children can hardly be remedied while the ignorance of the average mother remains what it now is. "There has never been a girl," says Confucius, "who

learned to bring up a child that she might afterwards marry." And yet how shall children be wisely brought up, until those who marry prepare themselves for the grave responsibilities which marriage brings? And how shall a girl, who is ignorant beforehand of every essential fact in connection with such responsibilities, assume them with intelligence when they devolve upon her?

If every modern girl, as did the Jewish maiden of old, were to look upon herself as the possible mother of a Messiah, how different would be the training, mental and physical, which she would herself demand.

It is my conviction that girls should be educated at least as soon as boys, and taught as impressively, if not more impressively than they are taught. Herbert Spencer says: "Men care comparatively little for erudition in woman, but very much for physical beauty, and good nature, and sound sense." He goes on to ask "How many conquests does the blue-stocking make through her extensive knowledge of history? What man ever fell in love with a woman because she understood Italian? Where is the Edwin, who was brought to Angelina's feet, by her German? But rosy cheeks and laughing eyes," he continues, "are great attractions. A finely-rounded figure draws admiring glances. The liveliness and good-humor that overflowing health produces go a great way towards establishing attachments."

Now it is an undisputed fact that the average man does care comparatively little for erudition in women, and very much for physical beauty, good nature, and sound sense, but on the other hand, where these last three attributes are supplemented by erudition, the cultured man cannot fail to be more attracted by their owner than were she imperfectly and unwisely educated. Rosy cheeks and laughing eyes, liveliness and good humor, are certainly great attractions, but as certainly they are not in themselves sufficient to establish that attraction when once it has been generated, or to produce the comprehending companionship without which marriage is only a social compromise. Learning and health have not proved to be incompatible in the case of men; why should they be so in the case of women? In both sexes overstudy produces the like disastrous results, but while Edwin may not have been brought to his Angelina's feet by her German, after her rosy cheeks and laughing eyes have accomplished that

result, it will scarcely be supposed that, admitting *his* knowledge of German, he will not be pleased to find that Angelina shares this knowledge with him. No man ever fell in love with a woman *because* she understood Italian, but this accomplishment on her part, granting him to be a cultured man, would not put a barrier between them after she had won his love, but would rather increase his affection for her by adding to his admiration of her physical charm the delight of a sympathy in taste. Indeed, Spencer himself says: "Educate as highly as possible—the higher the better—providing no bodily injury is entailed." And the same great teacher goes on to say: "Perhaps nothing will so much hasten the time when body and mind will both be adequately cared for as a diffusion of the belief that the preservation of health is a *duty*. Few seem conscious that there is such a thing as physical morality."

But how shall health be preserved and physical morality obtained by those who are kept in ignorance of the laws by which health and physical morality are governed? A thinking child is never satisfied, when told to do a certain thing or to abstain from doing it, by the assertion, "You must do it because I, your parent, tell you that you must, and what I tell you is right." They wish to know why certain things are, in themselves, right, and it is justice that they should know.

As a mere matter of self defence such knowledge should be given to children. A mother who keeps it from them acts as foolishly as a hypothetical lioness who proceeds to tear out her young one's claws, that they may be as harmless as doves,—not reflecting that, unlike doves, they have no wings to bear them out of the dangers against which their claws would have protected them.

In no case are ignorant boys or girls perfectly safe, either with themselves or with others.

There is another way in which parents meet this question, and that is by saying—or thinking—"Oh, *my* children have none of these horrid tendencies! *My* children will never be exposed to such dangers!" No mother knows the tendencies of her children until she has established between her and them an intimate friendship in which confidences of every kind shall be freely made and returned, tempered by a judicious wisdom on her part, —for it is hardly necessary to state that all unessential details in

regard to facts, whether mental or physical, should be repressed by grown people in their disclosures to children.

The mother who reasons that she has never had any unusual or abnormal tendencies or temptations herself, and that therefore her children will not have them, might be helped by an analogy drawn from the following scientific fact mentioned by Darwin in his "Origin of Species." "A single bud out of many thousands produced year after year on the same tree, under uniform conditions, has been known suddenly to assume a different character; and buds on distinct trees, growing under different conditions, have sometimes yielded nearly the same variety; for instance, buds on peach trees producing nectarines, and buds on common roses producing moss-roses."

In addition to the more serious consequences involved by such ignorance it often causes young girls to be placed in a false light, and misjudged for what are to them the most innocent actions and statements.

To those who consider that a lack of knowledge constitutes innocence, and therefore imply that an embroidered flower is more truly innocent than any thinking child can ever be, no matter what the amount of restraint exercised over its reason and curiosity, these views can hardly seem judicious, but at least I venture to hope that there are many who will agree with me in my belief that Innocence is only in the highest sense worthy and useful when it is the result of choice, not of accident.

AMÉLIE RIVES.

A FORECAST OF MR. GLADSTONE'S NEW ADMINISTRATION.

BY JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

"THE situation is the most complicated, and in many respects the most interesting that has occurred in the Parliamentary history of these islands." In these words a friend, who is a distinguished member of the House of Lords, writes to me about the crisis through which Great Britain and Ireland have just been passing—the crisis of the General Elections. Nothing can be more just than the estimate of the situation expressed in the words which I have just quoted. It is one of the most complicated and one of the most interesting political situations that have ever occurred in our Parliamentary history. A great political party has fallen—a party which came in six years ago fortified by one of the strongest numerical majorities that have ever in our time sustained an administration. All through the course of the six years' Parliament that majority kept dwindling away. At almost every bye-election—that is, an election caused by a death, or a resignation, or an appointment to office of some kind, judicial or otherwise, which did not permit the retention of a seat in the House of Commons—the government lost a vote and the opposition under Mr. Gladstone gained one. This process went on so fast and so far that the opposition began to feel convinced that whenever the general elections came around Mr. Gladstone would be sure to have a tremendous, an overwhelming majority at the polls. The elections have come and gone, and have not justified these expectations. The Tory government, of course, was defeated; that everyone on either side knew was certain to be the result, but the Liberals have not anything like the majority they expected. In fact, but for the Irish National party they would not have any majority at all—they would be low down in a minority. Now, let us look at the importance of this fact. I

shall do my best to look at it with the calm, unprejudiced eye of an outer observer, if I can, and shall try not to let my partizan feelings guide me in any way as regards my estimate of realities and of the existing situation.

The Liberal party will have an ample majority for carrying ordinary measures of reform and for maintaining themselves in office and in power. But they draw that majority from Ireland, and the first great reform they will have to undertake is the reorganization of the whole system of Irish government—in other words, Home Rule. Mr. Gladstone is pledged to make this his first important measure. No one doubts—I least of all men am likely to doubt—the sincerity of his determination. I am perfectly certain that Mr. Gladstone would not accept office at all at his time of life but for his noble and generous desire to carry Home Rule and so settle the Irish question. If he had a great English majority behind him he would have no real difficulty in accomplishing that object. But the result of the elections suggests some serious difficulties in the way, not of the final triumph of Home Rule—about that no reasonable man can have any serious doubt—but about the immediate result. For it is certain that the House of Lords will be greatly emboldened to throw out a Home Rule Bill by the fact that the majority in favor of Home Rule is not found in England or in Scotland or in Wales, but in Ireland. I wish to make myself clear upon this point. A majority of the Scottish representatives and of the Welsh representatives are undoubtedly in favor of Home Rule, but these are not numerically strong enough to counterbalance the numbers of the English Tories.

The truth is that we have not even yet got a fair chance of ascertaining at an election the views of the majority of the English people—or even of the English voters. In the meantime, however, the House of Lords will unquestionably take courage from the fact that the majority which returns Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals to office is a majority composed of Irish Nationalist members. If the Irish Nationalist members could be induced to withdraw their support from Mr. Gladstone he would have to go out of office. Of course the great argument of the Anti-Home Rulers has been that Great Britain and Ireland are all one, and that there is no need for a separate system of Irish legislation. On this principle it would be logically absurd to say that a majority of Irishmen in favor of Mr. Gladstone ought to

count for less than a majority of Englishmen. But the Lords will not reverence logic or shrink from absurdity. They will say: "We already knew the opinion of the Irish members. We knew they were for separation and rebellion and flat burglary and all the rest of it. What we wanted to know was the opinion of Great Britain; and, lo and behold you, here we have it, in the fact that Mr. Gladstone's majority is not drawn from Great Britain, but from Ireland. Why, then, should we hesitate to throw out a measure which has not the support of the majority of the people of Great Britain, and has only the support of a majority of our hereditary enemies, the people of Ireland?"

Now undoubtedly this is an inconvenient position for Mr. Gladstone to be placed in. The House of Lords in the end can easily be disposed of, Suppose Mr. Gladstone were to send up the Home Rule measure—having carried it successfully through the Commons—the House of Lords would no doubt throw it out. What would Mr. Gladstone do then? Appeal to the country against the House of Lords, many people here have been saying—have another general election and see if the popular vote would not further strengthen him. Now in my opinion Mr. Gladstone will do nothing of the kind. I am convinced that he will not allow to the House of Lords the honor and glory of dictating to the country the time when there is to be a general re-election of a representative chamber. Whatever he may do, that I feel convinced he will not do. He can send up a new Home Rule Bill in the next session—the same bill cannot be introduced twice in one session—and then if the House of Lords should threaten to reject it a second time he can retaliate on the House with the menace of the creation of new peers—a sufficient number of new peers to out-top the combined numerical strength of those who are opposed to Home Rule. When once a Prime Minister can make announcement that the Sovereign has authorized him to undertake a fresh creation of peers for a special purpose there is an end to the controversy. The existing peers hold out no longer. Why should they? What would be the good? The measure which they detested would be carried in either case—only if they stood out they would have to submit to the introduction of a crowd of new peers into their sacred chamber. The threat therefore is quite enough. The "gone coon" of the peerage always comes down. The menace has never

been made in my days. It was last made as a means of compelling the peers to pass the great Reform Bill of 1832. I do not think it is likely that we shall be compelled to have recourse to anything of the kind in 1892.

Therefore I take it for granted that when the end comes the peers will quietly give in and allow the Home Rule measure to pass. In the meantime, however, there must be a delay if, as I fully expect, the House of Lords should muster up the courage to throw out the Home Rule Bill on its first presentation to them. Then Mr. Gladstone would probably call an early sitting of the next session and bring in the bill again. But something could be done in the meantime, and that is just the question which I wish my readers to consider. We suppose the House of Lords to have thrown out the Home Rule Bill on its first introduction. What can Mr. Gladstone propose to do in the meantime?

I may perhaps be allowed to explain to American readers that our way of conducting an election here is quite unlike anything known in the United States. We do not hold our general elections on one and the same day throughout these two islands; we do not anywhere close the public houses, but on the contrary we leave them open and in full swing; and we allow to a voter as many votes as he has property or other qualification to secure to him. A voter in England may have a vote out of his place of business in the City of London—the city, properly so called—that part of London which is under the municipal jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor. He may have another vote for his dwelling-house in the West End of London. He has perhaps a country house in one of the shires, and he has a vote because of that. He may have two or three country houses, and he is entitled to a vote for each in the electoral division to which it belongs. He has a shooting place in Scotland—and he gets a vote in the Scottish division for that. He has a hunting place in one of the great English hunting counties, and he has a vote for that. There is no limit but the limit of property and possession to the number of votes a man may have in these countries. Our system of allowing the elections to be held on all manner of different days makes this plurality of votes a substantial reality. A voter thus happily endowed has plenty of time to make practical use of his privilege.

The late elections have covered something like a fortnight of time. According to our electoral law the writs or warrants for

the holding of elections are issued by the Speaker at Westminster and are sent to all the constituencies. They are not quite indeterminate as to time—the elections must be taken within a smaller number of days in boroughs and a larger number of days in counties. But the law is sufficiently vague to leave a very considerable margin of days at the discretion of the local authorities. If you are a candidate for a parliamentary seat in Great Britain or Ireland you may be elected on the first or second day this week, while your friend and colleague in a parliamentary party does not have his fate decided until the end of the week following. The local authorities are usually supporters of the party in power, and they will naturally fix the days of voting to suit the convenience of their own friends. Therefore we may be sure that if in some county division rather remote from London there are several voters who live habitually in London, and who have votes in divisions near London, the arrangements will be so made as to give them ample time to get down to the remoter constituency and record their votes. In this way the plurality of votes comes to be a serious thing. A return of majorities is only a return of a majority of votes and not of a majority of voters. It is quite possible to have a majority of votes without a majority of voters. It is quite possible to have a political party sent into power by a majority of votes without a majority of voters.

I need hardly point out that this tells heavily against the Liberal party. The great strength of that party is found in the working democracy—and the artizans in the towns and the peasants on the lands do not as a rule have many different properties, and many different parks and pleasances in England, and shooting-boxes in Scotland and fishing-lodges in Wales, and town-houses in the West End of London. Therefore there has been of late years a strong wave of popular feeling swelling up against this plural vote system which gives plurality to property and to property only ; and it has taken the definite form of demand for the system of One Man, One Vote. The first great reform, after Home Rule, to which the Radical party will apply itself will be the reform which gives to each man, rich or poor, one vote and one vote only. We shall no doubt come to have all our general elections held on the same day ; but if we had got rid of the plurality of votes the one day for all the elections would be a matter of very minor importance.

Another necessary and imperative reform is a change in the system of registration. "Tedious it were to tell, and hard to hear," as Shakespeare's Petruchio says, if I were to attempt to explain to American readers the tortuosities of our registration system—the system of record which finally affirms a man's right to have a vote. It is enough to say that although a voter may be perfectly entitled to his vote he has to fight his corner and prove his case at every annual registration, or he loses his vote—if any one objects to having his vote recorded. It is an annual case of proving over and over again your right to what is your own. Now what the Liberals say is—it ought to be the duty of the local authorities to secure a man's right whether he is able to attend the registration court and bear witness to it or not. The local authorities have no difficulty in finding out whether a man is or is not bound to pay so much a year in taxes and so much a year in poor-rates. They take very good care that each person so liable shall pay up his taxes and his rates.

Now all the Liberals ask is that the same parental authority which kindly, but firmly, ascertains whether a man is or is not liable to pay so much to the State and the parish, and finding him liable does at once proceed to enforce the liability, shall also take care that if his name ought to appear on the list of voters, his name shall appear there without any cost, trouble, or loss of time on his part. Not a very unreasonable demand in the way of reform, most Americans would doubtless say. No; not a very unreasonable demand, but a demand of the utmost importance in this country where whole masses of voters among the poorer classes are disfranchised every year because they have not the time to look after the business of their registration and the opponents of their political party find time enough to organize an opposition to their registration in their absence. The two reforms I have spoken of would give expression for the first time to the real political sentiments of the vast majority of the people of England.

As I write, just after the elections are over, or practically over, there are two opinions among members of the Liberal party—I speak now of genuine Liberals. There are a few men who think that Mr. Gladstone would do wisely to put off Home Rule for a short time and to pass a measure for One Man, One Vote, and another measure for improved registration, and having secured

these reforms as a preliminary condition then to bring in the Home Rule Bill. Of course, if we had these preliminary reforms passed the Home Rule Bill would be a foregone conclusion. I know that Radicals as advanced as Mr. Labouchere, for example, are in favor of this course of proceeding. Therefore I feel bound to treat the suggestion with all manner of seriousness and all manner of respect. Nevertheless it will not do, and I feel convinced that Mr. Gladstone has no intention of adopting any such course of policy. Home Rule must come on before anything else. Mr. Gladstone lost office for the sake of Home Rule, he has regained office because of Home Rule and he knows that the people of Ireland, and the vast Irish population of the United States and Canada and Australia, look to him to inaugurate his return to power by introducing a measure for the setting up of Home Rule in Ireland. I take it for granted that this is what he will do. On that point I cannot admit into my own mind any manner of doubt. But there is not the slightest reason why, when his ministry gets to actual work, he should not himself introduce a Home Rule scheme on one day, and others of his colleagues introduce a One Man, One Vote bill and a reformed registration bill the same day or the day after. The bills could then follow in each other's steps easily enough, and if Mr. Gladstone should not be able to force his Home Rule Bill through the House of Lords on the very first rush, he might easily secure the passing of the other measures which would make Home Rule, at the next time of its introduction, a matter of certainty and of easy success.

There is another way of doing the work. Mr. Gladstone may bring in a Home Rule bill in the first session of the new Parliament. He has majority enough—quite enough—to carry his bill through the House of Commons. It goes up to the Lords, and the Lords, as I have said, reject it. Then Mr. Gladstone could call another session very early, and bring in the Home Rule Bill again; and meantime the country would be roused to such an agitation against the House of Lords that the peers would feel they must either give in or give out. The peers would feel—must know—that if they were to carry resistance any farther, there would be an uprising of public opinion before which the House of Lords would go down like an Alpine village before an avalanche. The House of Lords, as a political institution, holds on to existence by a very slender thread. We all remember the

story of the very old lady who talked to Fontenelle, still older, about the kindliness of death in having passed them over for so long a time. "Hush, madame," Fontenelle replied; "don't remind Death—he may only have forgotten us." I should think the saner members of the House of Lords would feel somewhat as Fontenelle felt, and would be inclined to urge that public opinion might not be compelled to remember the existence of the hereditary chamber.

By such a process as this, Home Rule might be carried even without the necessity of waiting for the full operation of such measures as the establishment of the principle of One Man, One Vote and the much-needed reform in the system of registration. But in the meanwhile I hope and believe that the Liberal government, when it has fairly settled itself in office, will introduce all three reforms as nearly as possible side by side. When I say as nearly as possible side by side, I mean that I hope and believe the first place will be given to Home Rule, the next to One Man, One Vote, and the third to a better system of registration. Then if the Lords throw out the Home Rule Bill—or rather, I should say, when the Lords had thrown out the Home Rule Bill—the other measures of reform might be carried. The Lords would hardly venture to reject three great popular measures in one session, and there would be easy work for the Liberals in the following year.

Nothing could be more curious than the kind of talk which has been heard lately among some of the supporters of the Tory government. It has been heard even from the mouths of practical Tory politicians, who ought to know much better. Why, they ask, should Lord Salisbury resign? Why should he regard a vote of no-confidence or a vote of censure passed against him by a majority of forty-two? Forty-two is not a very great majority, as numbers in Parliament now go. Why should he not stick on and refuse to leave office until some definite and practical measure of his is thrown out by the House of Commons? The younger Pitt sat on, supported by his Sovereign, in defiance of many a majority of the House of Commons. So he did; but we have a good deal outgrown the times of the younger Pitt; and the present Sovereign of England is not in the least likely to try to revive the arbitrary days of George the Third. The time when any Sovereign could venture to uphold a defeated ministry against a majority of the House of Commons expired with George the

Fourth—or, at all events, with William the Fourth. We may take it for granted that Queen Victoria, who has been the model of a constitutional sovereign, will not listen for one moment to the crazy suggestions which some speakers and writers, who profess to be devoted loyalists, are spontaneously offering to her. Nor do I believe for an instant that Lord Salisbury or Mr. Balfour could be influenced by such preposterous counsel. I am writing in anticipation of events, but I venture thus far to assume the strain of the prophet. There will be no attempt made to set aside by ministerial pertinacity or by royal will the decision of the constituencies of Great Britain and Ireland. Whatever else may happen, that will not happen. There will be every effort made, of course, on the part of the Conservatives, to prevent the Liberal majority from carrying out their purposes of reform, but it will be by side-strokes, and not by a *coup d' état.*

There is one possibility which nobody here seems to be considering, but which yet I venture to think is worthy of consideration. How, if the Tory statesmen were to admit that their Local Government Bill for Ireland, introduced and abandoned last session, had failed to give satisfaction to Parliament and were to undertake to bring in a much wider bill, with an intimation—sent round by whisper and by private interview—that it might be hammered in committee into a genuine measure of Home Rule, which they, the Tories, could easily pass through the House of Lords? The House of Lords would swallow anything coming from a Tory government, and so all trouble would be saved.

Were Disraeli living now, and in any manner of physical strength, this, I have very little doubt, is the way in which he would manage to outflank his opponents. This is exactly what he did, when, having in 1866 defeated Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill by the aid of some secessionist Liberals and turned Mr. Gladstone out of office, he himself in 1867 brought in another reform bill and carried it by the help of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright wanted a good measure of suffrage reform and did not care who carried it as long as it was carried. Mr. Gladstone now wants to see Home Rule carried, and does not, I am sure, care who has the nominal honor of carrying it, if only it is carried. But then, Disraeli has long been dead, and Lord Salisbury is the leader of the Conservative party.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

NOT IN SOCIETY.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

As NATIONS become civilized, they naturally abrogate the cumbrous ceremonials with which barbarism impedes the machinery of government, and as individuals become cultured and intellectual, they throw off with spontaneous impatience the swaddling bands of formal society. Every community now has a goodly number of these Social Dissenters—men and women who are "not in society," and who are neither pained nor shamed by the fact, but rather avow it with the complaisance of clever people who have found out a fraud.

These Social Dissenters are by no means from the unknown or unimportant classes. They are usually people of distinction, who live well, dress fashionably, pay their bills, are blameless in character, courteous, hospitable, and with no taint of cynicism in their nature; yet they "save themselves" from their fellows, and, without explanations or regrets, refuse to add one more to the hundreds of persons leading a life that has no attractions for them.

If asked for the "why and wherefore" of their conduct they find reasons "plenty as blackberries." They assert that "Society" fills life with imaginary duties; that it permits no ideals, but levels all to the same plane; giving no more regard to the brightest intellect than to the mental tag-rag who fringe its dinner-tables and drawing-rooms; that it forces all the world into the circumference of a gibus-hat; and yet, that its social joys are the real social penalties, and an invitation to a great many entertainment a far worse thing than to be excluded from all them. They ask why they should leave their own occupations and break through their own habits to accept the hours, the cooking, and the friends of others, when all conversation is frowned down by Society which is not so placidly commonplace as to be incapable

of offending any one's prejudices, likes, or dislikes ; where indeed conversation is on such a dead level that it is not necessary to talk at all, only to smile, utter interjections and appear to be amused. Besides these and many other minor counts, they finally declare Society's ethical judgments to be narrow, pharisaical, and often very unjust ; while it accepts constantly conventionalities, in the place of the most important realities.

But as a rule there are few conditions in life which are not many-sided and capable of being defended on every side. And we must first notice that social secessionsts are expecting Society to be what Society never purposes or wishes to be, and that therefore they might as justly complain that a man is a hedger or ditcher when he might be a poet or a preacher. Society never yet set itself to be good or great. It has no higher mission than to promote social pleasure and order, and the qualifications it requires are not piety or intellect, but the ability to dress well, to say a great deal about nothing, to lead a dance, to keep every tittle of the rigid traditional law of uniformities, and in all disputed questions, or doubtful positions, to imitate that truly great and wise man, the Levite, rather than the officious, demonstrative Samaritan.

We must, of course, admit that this is a low moral and intellectual plane, but it is a plane which satisfies the aspirations and capabilities of the majority who tarry there ; and all things in life are not equally happy and justifiable. Looked at in relation to the needs of individual souls, society duties do seem to be utter vanity ; and, of course, we all acknowledge that it is a better thing to be a bishop than a dancing master ; yet if dancing masters are necessary, then one office is as exactly right and moral as the other. And no one is compelled to become a society man or a society woman ; but what a vast number of people would be at a loss how to dress themselves, and what to do with themselves, if Society did not devise their clothing, their habits, their pleasures, and the most trivial details of their lives for them !

Nor is this social dictation altogether a bad thing for the world. We have only to remember the number of silly, ignorant, selfish, self-willed people loose and at leisure, and imagine them going up and down and to and fro in the world with their own natural tastes and tempers, and indulging these without regard

to the feelings and rights of others, and we should quickly understand that there are cases in which individuality would cease to be the charming and desirable thing it is supposed to be. And then we should cordially admit that it is an excellent thing for Fashionable Society to take charge of this element and manage it with the tight rein of its unwritten but inexorable laws.

For, as a rule, if people submit to this kind of chaperonage, it is evidence that they require it—that they are of that large majority of average men and women who are never confounded by the great enigmas of life nor ambitious of its highest duties, nor yet capable of its widest liberties; though it is a fact that many of the cleverer sort make of the very limitations of Society an effectual freedom, it being a truth, to those willing to take this kind of truth, that much may be gained by giving up a little.

For if a man or woman dress rigorously in the mode, pay the social mint, anise, and cummin, speak in the regulation social shibboleth, then he or she may take a considerable latitude. A man may be soured to the core of his nature, cynical and sensual, but it is not the business of Society to notice these things, if only he observe the decencies of life, wear the regulation costume, and show himself occasionally in the proper drawing-rooms; and a woman who transacts her Sunday church exercise regularly, and observes all the greater or lesser laws of Society, is not expected to render an account of her private life to the respectable world, whose business is only with the appearing side of things.

This position brings us to the ethics of Society, which are constantly affirmed to be unjust, unmerciful, and not always virtuous. Society, however, never pretends to be a teacher of morality. That is the office of religion and of law. Society contents itself with making scapegoats of such of its members as outrage public opinion by being found out. An obvious example is the case of any woman who is known to have broken the law of purity. Religion forgives her. Society never forgives her. It forgives her partner in sin, without even requiring that he shall sin no more; but for her it has no pardon and no palliation. For socially it is not a question of relative guilt; it is one entirely of social considerations; and Society's verdict is in accordance therewith. There is a redundancy of women; they are less important than men; they are more easily hit, and they are not as able to strike back; therefore, through the woman, Society makes testimony

to the fact that it wishes to recognize the moralities it has been powerless to enforce. It cannot always be virtuous, but it can occasionally sacrifice a young kid, or send some poor scapegoat into the wilderness of its oblivion. This, truly, is not the code of the Holy Scriptures; but then the social code is not divine, it is human. And it is perhaps well that the two differ, else the lower might debase the higher; and it is better for humanity to have some ideally high standard, though they never reach it, than one so low that it may be reached every day.

Still, as a rule, the Decalogue stands as a finality, and the morals of society have been gradually uplifted by this fact. Many can remember a time when it was rather fashionable for vice to swagger in the face of virtue; now the social law demands that vice wear a mask and a robe of some decent kind. Whatever broad road of sin is followed by its members privately, in public all Society's ways must be ways of decency, and all its paths must be proper; and those who defy this command are very apt to be scapegoated as examples of social morality.

Of course, every one is aware that the scapegoats of society are seldom any worse than the other goats, and that they are often unjustly chosen. Perhaps they have only offended against some prejudice or deeply-rooted custom, and have to take the consequences. But that contingency is in the contract; for Society has the right and the obligation of self-defence, and must protect itself against whatever it conceives to be injurious to itself. To be sure, this is very sad, but not sadder than many things in life; and as the Scriptures teach us that one sinner has no right to complain of the favor shown another sinner, we must infer a fundamental justice in the position, whose roots may be behind this existence. One comfort remains to these unfortunates—they may reflect that they have, and always have had, many companions; and that after awhile they will not feel nearly as unhappy as they expected to feel; nay, they may even come to consider their banishment as an enfranchisement.

With an instinctive justice Society pounces upon literary offenders, because it apprehends literary immorality to be a powerful incentive to social immorality. Hence the writers of uncleanly literature are scapegoated—and very properly so—with little ceremony. For Society may tolerate a man who breaks all the ten commandments in private; but it will not suffer the man

who describes the breaking of them in a book. Society may hold it no social crime to covet all a neighbor's possessions, but it does hold it a crime for a novelist to covet an imaginary wife. And there is a positive and evident justice in this estimate. For it is the object of Society to keep respectable on the surface, therefore it will not tolerate those who seek below its surface for the sins it does not indorse publicly. So then, if an author use his imagination to penetrate social depths, and there beget all kinds of murders and adulteries and human monsters, he deserves the social ostracism that is sure to be given him. Society then—though it acts from lower and more partial aims than the Decalogue—is a moral and conserving agent; and a law unto many who would heed no other law half so well.

We must thank Society also for preventing much offensive, ill-conditioned personality. It teaches the young and foolish some decent self-restraint. Let us imagine girls of sixteen disdaining the usual dress and usual forms of civility, and inflicting on the world their own crude, undisciplined individuality; yawning in the faces of all who bored them, admiring with the *naiveté* of young savages, "saying just what they thought,"—that is, pleasing themselves without any consideration for others—and we shall be ready to admit the superiority of the Society girls who have been taught to suppress their spontaneity, who have themselves well in hand, who give themselves to their company, and play their part graciously and without a trip—the girls who understand *les convenances* and obey them, who do not "take up causes" or make their philanthropy conspicuous, who have no extreme views, whose passions are small, whose prejudices are mild and lady-like, and who can pay court to the fortunate or shrink from the unfortnnate with an equally charming frankness.

For we must consider that as yet the people capable of dwelling alone with their own souls, and with the immortal part of other souls, are in the minority. The majority abhor solitude; they find anything better than their own company. To think! to read! to be alone! These three things are intolerable to people who love the world and the fashion thereof. And if it gives any men or women satisfaction to dress, to eat, to talk, and to amuse themselves precisely as a crowd of other people dress, eat, talk, and amuse themselves; if they prefer to merge their own natures

and tastes and lives in the general mass of Society ; to turn night into day ; to sit long hours over a single meal ; to dress half a dozen times in twenty-four hours ; to make penitential drives in the park and spin round half the night in a temperature of ninety degrees ; to be tyrannized over by a "set" in the world, and by a crowd of lazy, impudent servants in their homes—if they like this kind of thing, then Society is the kind of thing they will like.

And surely common justice demands that each person be permitted to seek happiness in the form he or she thinks most satisfactory, whether it be in the union and sympathy of a crowd, or in the peace of an individual friendship with nature and books. For in respect that society is what it is, it is a very good life ; but in respect that it is not more spiritual and intellectual, it is a very poor life. And yet, perhaps, some power intrinsically better could be better done without.

AMELIA E. BARR.

A PLAIN TALK ON THE DRAMA.

BY RICHARD MANSFIELD.

THERE is little or no doubt that the ancient order of things has been relegated to a back-shelf in an obscure corner, where none but antiquarians, bookworms, and historians will care to meddle with it. The man who attempts to play "Faust" or "Macbeth" or "Hamlet," *tout simplement*, without all the accessories which accompany, say, a Drury Lane pantomime, will be very drearily left alone.

Strong and sincere acting, from the mind and from the heart, simple and true, honest and earnest, goes by unnoticed. We must have something eccentric. Out of the Japanese craze, the æsthetic craze, the craze for the quaint and the radically hideous, were born some strange things, and the shades of Edmund Kean and of Garrick shrank back into dark corners.

The actor rarely now depends upon his *acting*. He must be a diplomat and a courtier too; he must placate a hundred people who write and thousands who entertain; he must be a thing to be gaped at and wondered at; he must loll and pose in drawing-rooms, and be a snob and a sycophant, or he is very likely to fail. His speech must be different to that of any earthly human being, and far from holding the mirror up to nature, he must, if he hold up any mirror at all, make it like unto our familiar nursery tea-pot, in which we saw our little forms and faces strangely and marvellously spread out and distorted. The extravagant—the absurdly extravagant—productions (as they are named) have frightened away all comers. The young and ambitious actor dare not, as of old, launch into Shakespeare, unless he have some thirty-five thousand dollars to lose in one venture; and what young man has?

The critics have been the same in all times ; they have always found fault, it 's their privilege and their business. Read the reviews of Kean's *Richard III.* and see how harshly they treated him; and is any man great until he is dead or as good, or as bad, as dead ? But *the people* in the olden times *came,—the people* ; they crowded the house and they crowded the stage, and the man who stirred them and thrilled them was a hero. To-day he is a monster to be avoided, and the penny shows hold all his former enthusiastic patrons. To-day, as we approach the serious portion of a play, when the tears are likely to follow and the heart to beat a little faster, when there may be a thrill of horror or a gasp of agony, we men rise from our seats and go complaining to our clubs. And, therefore, what is the actor to act, and who is the actor who pre-eminently is likely to succeed financially ? The man at whom we can laugh, or scoff, or who is so small, so eccentric and so petty in his efforts that he never stirs, and is only " clever " where he should be great ? And what great and successful examples are held up to young actors to follow ? What does he see succeed and what will he not, therefore, consider right ! That which every man, with eyes in his head, knows to be wrong. And no reliance at home upon ourselves, but a great snobbish homage to everything from abroad !

This a country, too, that has brought forth Booths and Charlotte Cushman, and fostered Fechters and Forrests, and a list of giant names ! Have not the greatest actors the American stage has seen been thoroughly well snubbed abroad ? In France ignored totally, and in England dined and fêted, but carefully and particularly put away and disabled and lopped off, and marched out of the land with great pretence of hospitality, and, sent home, with a burning heart, a shame-flushed face and an empty, empty, empty purse, while the foreigner sat back and smiled at his clever treachery ? And it's true, true every word of it.

Do not American correspondents eternally cable to domestic newspapers long stories of the wonders achieved by this man and that man over there, who sits up in his holiday pride, and blinks his little eyes, and says: "See how they gape at me over there ; write of me constantly, my American friend. I'm of great interest to your people, who have nothing of their own, and presently I will come to them, and teach them some of my

art, and take their dollars, of which I gain but few in my own land." And when he enters is he a whit better than, or half as sincere as, was your Booth or your Barrett or your Davenport or your Gilbert or your Wallack ?

You may turn the foreign sheets inside out, topsy turvy, or what you will, and find no one word concerning American art. Pshaw ! American art ! I've seen that quick, covert smile when some man spoke of "American art" at the Garrick Club, in Garrick street, Covent Garden, and I've heard the greatest British critic shriek : "Your American drama is damned vulgar." Ye gods and little fishes ! Vulgar ! Think of the vulgarities of the plum-duff drama and the importations we 've wondered at. Is this bitter ? Not a jot. It 's true, that 's all.

Your American critic will berate you soundly with his pen, but he won't sell you for a dollar, and cannot be bought, and veritably I believe he 'll defend the very one he chastises, if another attack him. This is no longer a colony, but a great land, where our art shall be so fine that those who come to us may learn and bow and copy, and not pat us on the head any longer, and strut around and patronize, and sigh great sighs of happy contentment when the time comes for departure with pockets full of our gold. And wherefore do you pay them three heavy dollars for a seat from which to look at them, when upon those of your own country, who bring you as much and more, you will bestow with reluctance only half that gracious sum ? Pray tell me this !

Why has no actor in your chief cities a stage of his own ? Why do theatres belong to managers, business men who have acquired fortunes in this or that trade and now let them out, like bath-houses at great and stultifying rates to poor itinerant players ? Have you no rich men—no men who will build and rent at a fair rental ? No friends such as English art has in London ? What a privilege to create great characters and play great plays for the suffering of paying three thousand dollars a week to a stranger ? What is this trade in actors and plays, this speculating and gambling, this slave market, this crushing down of the one that rises, this merchanting in actors and actresses, and the smiling octopus that sucks all things dry, this playing *down* to *people*, instead of playing *up* to art, and dragging the people after ? You have great managers, such men as are Augustin Daly and Palmer and Frohman, but you may have actors, too, in their own

houses, and make all things even, not all up on one side, which is dangerous, at a glance, to any good ship, and most of all to the furtherance of the voyage we are on.

Let the managers have their theatres and the actors theirs, and the rivalry will benefit the Drama. Let the poet realize some of his dreams, the actor and the painter, and come and look at them. They may be strange, these dreams, and weird and odd and not successful, but there will be something gained and something new, and not the same eternal drumming out of $A^2 + B^2 \times A^2 + B^2$ and its monotonous result. We want poetry upon the stage. Poetry! The stage is for Poetry. It is not for merchants and mechanics and penny-a-liners. It is for Poetry! I would stand upon this summit and cry out that this is a stupid business day, from the rising of the sun to the setting of it; that young men in short hose talk money, that middle-aged and old, and girls and women, and that we are dying of it and suffocating, that books are full of it, and that the air is laden with it, and that we go about with itching palms and hooked fingers; that all the world would be better for Poetry; that the heart would beat more gently, and the mind be more sweetly oiled, and the soul soar higher for the contemplation of Poetry.

And that is what the stage is for. Neither for rot, nor for drivel, nor for filth, nor for tanks of water, nor for ancient dames in tights, nor for cheap sentiment, nor for catchpennies, but for Poetry. And not incomprehensible either, for the "Morte d' Arthur" and all the "tales of the Round Table" are poetry, and "Hiawatha," and a thousand Indian legends there are that are poetry; and so is "Lucile" of poor dead Meredith, and all the things some of us, lying on the grass, with our faces to the sky-lark, dream of on a summer day or on a moonlit evening—those things that come to us with a whiff of the balsam pine or the break of the sea on the beach, or the touch of a soft hand or the discovery of a withered flower. It is in us always and it will crop out in the most hardened of us, and where we should always see it, and where it should forever awaken all that was born good and beautiful in us, is upon the stage.

The stage should not be for temptation, from the deliverance of which we pray in the morning and which we court in the evening; it should not be for the idiotic laugh and the imbecile applause; it is not for the drunkard and the wanton; it is not to

be shrieked at to-day and to be ashamed of tomorrow ; it is not for gymnastics ; it is for the gracious, the graceful, the thoughtful, the gentle ; it is to send us home with better thoughts and better feelings, with a lesson learnt by example and with food for pleasant reflection. It is for wholesome mirth or for such stirring tragedy as will fire us to nobler deeds, or for such potent example as will sicken us of evil doing. That is the stage as I understand it and as I would strive for it.

Let not the YOUTHFUL critic, from whose responsible pen depends the weighty power of a mighty journal, clip off the head of every bud that thrusts its head above the rotting leaves. Who knows how beautiful and how radiant it might grow to be ? A word written lasts longer than a word spoken, and what is printed is sometimes read, and what is read cannot be blotted out always. Separate the man from his art. If you dislike the man, you have no right to condemn his art. Your sense of honor must make you just. Personal abuse is not criticism. Never. It is unworthy of any great journal, and it degrades the country in which the journal is published. Criticise with dignity, if you criticise at all. What is worthy of criticism is worthy of respect. If it is absolutely unworthy, treat it as you treat the silliness of a strange child, with silence. Reflect when you say bitter and biting things how you would bear these words addressed to you. Think, before you tear down, how long it took to build up—what work, what suffering, what expenditure of hard-earned means. Remember that you are not writing to show the world how clever you are, but how just you can be. Recollect that your lightest word weighs heavy with the object of your praise or censure.

Do not fail to consider that the actor who works with his nerves, who has travelled much and suffered much, is an irritable being, dyspeptic perchance, and that bitter and hostile criticism is a cruel dose after a dish of enervating toil. Know that the actor is a child in his relations with the world and lives in a cloudland of his own. His one desire is to please ; when he fails he is angry with himself, angry with all the world about him. He has striven, and he generally knows in his heart, much better than you can tell him, that he has failed. Take the OBJECT of his attainment into consideration. If his art has in it the germ of goodness, or of greatness, pray foster and cherish it, and be kind,

and gracious, and gentle always. If you are harsh with him and unduly bitter or personal, do not blame him if he retaliates—he is probably only human ; and be man enough not to bear rancor if he gives you a Roland for your Oliver, since you have brought it upon yourself, and the "Freedom of the press" does not mean the privilege, with immunity, of abuse.

The bane of the American drama is the cheap theatre ; and if my protest can be heard and, being heard, be deemed a rightful protest, all men will stay away from it, henceforth forever. It counts for nothing that you can sit downstairs for fifty cents. One would rather eat a delicious dinner in a kitchen than masticate a vile mixture in a palace. Therefore it is better to sit upstairs and see an actor attempt good things than sit downstairs and see him succeed in doing bad. The success of the cheap theatre means the extinction of the gallery patronage. They are nearly gone now, those faces all aglow, those shirt-sleeved arms, those thunderous bursts of rapturous applause and the familiar earnest word of encouragement ; who so quick to recognize the actor's finest points, who so quick to laugh, so quick to weep, and who first spread the news of some great moment in an actor's life ? They are gone now, those honest faces ; we look for them in vain. The practical loss lies in the fact that in these days of heavy expenses the actor-manager must find his house all-over-full if he is to earn a profit.

It may be hoped that the American people is by now weary of what has been termed "Farce Comedy"—a conglomeration of various variety entertainments, formerly not under the head of our art, but indigenous to the music halls. It is to be hoped that it desires the poetic drama ; the gracious, gentle, and wholesome comedy ; the genuine burlesque, which, in the garb of witty satire, will teach many a healthy lesson ; the music of the ideal opera ; and it may be hoped too that each of these may be labelled and put away in its special box and not confused and mixed up.

It may be hoped that the American people will hospitably receive and welcome all that is good and great coming from abroad, such men as are indeed Irving, Salvini, Coquelin and the earnest Willard, and such a woman as the incomparable Helen Terry, or such as Hading is and Ristori was, but—those who live across the sea MUST equally recognize and welcome those who come to them with the indorsement of the American press and the American

people; and that recognition *shall not, must not* be earned at the cost of great wealth and wire-pulling and great sycophancy, but it must be a ready, hearty and open-armed recognition, at once spontaneous, as is ours, with no sneering at the American tongue and American manner,—since we sneer not at the foreign—and it may be hoped, with some certainty of realization, that the American drama will soon stand foremost in the drama of the nations.

RICHARD MANSFIELD.

REMINISCENCES OF JOHN BRIGHT.

BY HIS NEPHEW, CHARLES McLAREN.

A SIMPLE stone marks the resting place of John Bright in the Friends' Burial Ground in Rochdale. For well-nigh a century he, and his Quaker parents before him, had worshipped in the old-world meeting-house, whose plain and spotless interior is less part of the busy Rochdale of to-day, with its dark chimneys and countless shuttles, than of the clean, quiet old town on the fringe of the moors forming the breezy borderland between Lancashire and Yorkshire eighty years ago.

Tim Bobbin and Edwin Waugh have made the rich, quaint tongue of that countryside live in our literature. Wit, common sense, and outspoken fearlessness characterize those who speak it. Here, as in most English towns before the railway age, lived apart a smaller Quaker community, with the Puritan tradition undefiled, and from it sprang the foremost Liberal of these times. Just as the key to Mr. Gladstone's mental history is to be found in his Eton and Oxford life, so John Bright's inherited impulse to battle against greed and oppression in Church and State was intensified by these surroundings of his early years. They colored his nature as man and politician. He was trained from the first to political thought and effort. His father used to read the Manchester *Guardian* aloud on Saturday evenings to the children, while he talked of the days of Pitt and Castlereagh, and told them of the Luddites and of political persecutions that filled their hearts with hatred of Tory power and Tory principles. So, at a time when Bamford, Carlisle and "Orator" Hunt were already to the front in the struggle for Parliamentary Reform, the first public act of John Bright's childhood was to chalk "Hunt forever!" on the steps of his father's cotton mill. His literary tastes were formed and amply satisfied in the Quaker home life at Green Bank, where books filled the place of more frivolous amusements in the outside world. For the rest, his education was found in riding, fishing, cricket, and so forth, in close association with the sons of his father's workpeople. And thus he

grew up a practical, straightforward man, knowing and caring for his countrymen; an Englishman on the side of the English.

Among the earliest public lecturers in Birmingham was James Silk Buckingham, the founder of the original *Athenæum* paper. In moving a vote of thanks to him after a lecture in Rochdale, John Bright made his first speech. It is written in full, artificially constructed and polished, after the manner of a young literary hand. He subsequently wrote and delivered some lectures himself describing a journey to the Holy Land. Fluency and power he gained by speaking at political gatherings in the town, but this first effort is interesting as the key to the method of his oratory. While much of his language was coined on the spot from a mind familiar with every great English writer of verse or of prose, his arguments and illustrations, together with his perorations and many of his more striking passages, were carefully composed and committed to paper in the form of elaborate notes. He studied the form as well as the subject of his speeches; and his adherence from the first to good literary models kept him from degenerating into the merely fluent speaker.

Even his boyish letters were works of art. They breathed a tender sentiment which time never destroyed, and which gave a singular charm to his character. His devotion to his sister's and his childhood's home, where sweetbriar and roses crept around the door, and pears and cherries climbed over the plain red walls, helped to create in his mind that sense of the beauty and dignity of domestic life which runs through his speeches and touches every English heart. Shortly before his betrothal he wrote in French to his favorite sister, Priscilla:

> "Our dispositions seem very much the same. The things you like I like, and what gives you no pleasure has no attraction for me. Still it is almost certain that this happy union between us will be severed; perhaps you will have another companion in your journeys, and I shall be forced to seek elsewhere a partner of my joys and sorrows. But in every situation in which we may be placed we shall retain the same feelings for each other that we held in our youth; and the love which exists now will forever remain to sweeten the misfortunes which may await us."

His letters to her breathe the warmest affection down to the close of his life, and though on many social and political questions he and his sisters and brothers held opposite opinions, those differences never interfered with their regard for one another.

It was not until his first wife's death in 1841 that John Bright

plunged into the struggle against the protective Corn Laws, which were starving trade and pauperizing the country in the interests of the land-owning aristocracy. Richard Cobden then urged him to organize with himself a campaign against the tax on bread. Thus began the intimate friendships between the two men to which John Bright owed much, but to which Richard Cobden owed even more. In two years John Bright's name was in every English mouth. He became the most powerful speaker of the Anti-Corn-Law League. After a free trade campaign, which culminated in the historic demonstration at Drury Lane Theatre, he was returned in 1843 in the Radical interest for Durham City. It was a rare thing in those days of restricted franchises for a man of the middle class to enter the House of Commons. The ringers and wardens of Rochdale Parish would have rung the bells, but for the threats of the Tory Vicar. Great, however, were the rejoicings of the people, and the man who came racing over the meadows to Green Bank got a guinea for his news. A few days later the father received from Sir Thomas Potter, a Manchester merchant, this letter.

"I beg most sincerely to congratulate you on the success of your talented son at Durham. When he returned from a tour on the Continent, which by your liberality he was of course enabled to take, I heard (with admiration) of the exertions he made in communicating the information he obtained to his young friends at home, and before I had the pleasure of knowing him. This, with other circumstances, made a most favorable impression on my mind, and I have frequently inquired why he was not brought forward for his native town. Mr. Brooks and myself have determined that he shall have it in his power on entering the House of Commons to state that his election has not cost him a shilling, in which plan we are not afraid of our friends' support. If there is any amount your son is out of pocket please to place it to the account of Potter & Morris, and write me by return of post."

The son of this gentleman, by a curious coincidence the Palmerstonian candidate for Manchester at the general election of 1856, defeated John Bright himself, whose popularity had waned for a time through uncompromising opposition to the Crimean and Chinese wars. But during the forty years John Bright sat in Parliament for Durham, Manchester, and Birmingham in succession, the precedent created by Sir Thomas Potter was followed by other friends, and he never had to pay any election expenses.

Many of his old free trade friends deserted John Bright when he called for further reform of the electoral system. If he was known as "the first Tribune of the British people," it was because

he battled almost unaided during a whole generation for the people's emancipation from the aristocratic juntos of Whig and Tory landowners who, even after the first Reform Act of 1832, governed the country by a Parliament in which the real manhood of the country was unrepresented. It was due to his persistent agitation that the right of voting for members of Parliament was twice extended, until every male householder in the three Kingdoms obtained a voice in the National government. He helped them, too, in winning the right to vote by ballot, in spite of the alarm cry in vogue before America became the fashion in Pall Mall, that he was "Americanizing our institutions." Alone he vindicated in Parliament the cause of the United States in its struggle with "that great conspiracy against human nature," to use his own words, of the Rebel South. It was his giant influence which kept the nation right on that question; and they and he together extinguished the Whig and Tory plots against the Union to which the Palmerston cabinet, with the sanction of Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone, were lending a willing ear. No Englishman had a truer love for the great English Republic across the Atlantic than he. In concluding his speech at the Rochdale meeting held to thank the merchants of New York for their relief of the suffering people of the Lancashire cotton districts, he said: "From the very outburst of this great convulsion I have had but one hope and one faith, and it is this—that the result of this stupendous strife may be to make freedom the heritage forever of a whole continent, and that the grandeur and the prosperity of the American Union may never be impaired."

In his library at One Ash, among the books and pictures that tell the history of his political life, hang portraits of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and the autographs, framed, of both these great Presidents. A bust of John Bright alone with John Hampden among British statesmen, placed by Abraham Lincoln in the White House at Washington, remains today a tribute to his championship of the American cause. John Bright seldom made an unsuccessful speech. Like other artists, however, he was nervous, anxious and irritable until his work was done. When his speech was over, he was as happy and sympathetic as a child. If it was a speech in the House of Commons he would retire to the members' smoking room, or stand with his back to the fire in the division lobby, and, surrounded by a group

of parliamentary friends run over the debate with trenchant humor. If it was a public meeting, he would fall into his host's easy chair with a cigar, and talk far into the night on a thousand trivial topics to which his language lent a thousand charms. Dogs, parrots, innkeepers, Scotch ministers, minor poets, royalties, American visitors, sayings and doings of the political world, Highland gamekeepers, great men and small men, all interested him. No one who has ever felt it will forget the fascination of that monologue which seemed to gather force and interest as the hours went by. All the genius of his matchless eloquence was there, directed to the kindly as well as the serious side of life. As in his talk, so in his speeches, humor succeeded pathos, and indignation alternated with satire. The strength and purity of his language were in harmony with the rich vibration of his voice, and any lack of gesture was atoned for by the noble earnestness of his presence and the dramatic power of his mouth and eye. He touched his subject with a broad hand : "Gladstone," he said, "goes coasting along, turning up every creek and exploring it to its source before he can proceed on his way ; but I have no talent for detail. I hold my course from headland to headland through the great seas." Many of his happiest illustrations were the homeliest. One which delighted the political world at the time was pointed at Horsman and Lowe, who started the Whig seccession that ultimately defeated the Reform Bill of 1866. "This party of two reminds me of the Scotch terrier which was so covered with hair that you could not tell which was the head and which was the tail of it." "This came into my head," he related afterwards, "as I was walking down to the house. I thought first that it would do, and then that it would not do, and I determined not to use it. And while I was speaking it suddenly turned up in my mind, and it was a great success."

Poetry was an abiding pleasure with him. His favorite authors were Milton, Whittier, Longfellow, and Byron, and he loved to read their works aloud evening after evening to his children. He explored the by-paths of literature for undiscovered poets. His memory was stored with poems, which he would repeat as he drove along in his quiet journeys with his sisters or children through Scotland or Italy. "There is nothing," he used to say, "which gives so much pleasure as poetry, except little children."

Now and then he would jot down a verse or an epigram of his own in the album of a hotel. In the visitors' book of a little Highland inn near Inverness he condensed his views on the land question in these words:

> "In Highland glens 't is far too oft observed
> That men are chased away, and game preserved;
> Glen Urquhart is to me a lovelier glen,
> Here grouse and deer have not supplanted men."

He interested himself in restoring to Michael Bruce, the poor Scotch schoolmaster and poet, the authorship of the exquisite lines to "The Cuckoo," which, after Bruce's death, had been pilfered by Logan and published under the latter's name; and he sealed his belief in the task by a pilgrimage to Bruce's grave. He loved Scotland, and, in a sort of way, the Scotch. He had a little family of Scotch terriers of whom he was very fond. But a dog rarely came near him that he did not caress. Salmon fishing became his favorite, and, latterly, his only outdoor occupation, and he was a frequent and welcome guest on the best reaches of the Tweed and the Tay. "But I do n't always like Scotch theology," he said once; "it's too full of the gridiron." He had more sympathy with Robert Burns and the Scotch poets. His own religion was found in the Sermon on the Mount. Creeds and formularies were not to his liking. At a certain dinner he turned from a Highland minister of opposite political opinions and assertive tongue with the remark: "It's odd that a man who knows so little about this world can tell us so much about the next."

In matters political, however, he never indulged in toleration. The least agreeable part of his nature was a Johnsonian brusqueness, which the presence of any opposition and above all of Toryism in the company usually brought to the front. Toryism had broken lances with him for the best part of his life, not always in chivalrous fashion, but ever with disastrous results to the Tories. In 1880, when that party were invoking the wrath of heaven upon those who supported Mr. Bradlaugh, the Radical free-thinking member for Northampton, in claiming the right to take his seat in Parliament, John Bright remarked: "It is not his atheism that those fellows are afraid of. It is the practical Christianity of his politics." But he usually reserved his serious displeasure for the Whigs "who ought to know better." Tories

were merely "fools," and could be summarily disposed of. Disraeli, however, who boasted that politics were the best form of gambling he knew, was taken by John Bright at his own estimate. "Dizzy did not dislike me," he once said with a twinkle in his eye, "for I never stood in his way." Palmerston, "that old sinner," as he called him, was a far more heinous offender. The bully of Europe, the sham Liberal and the cynical foe of reform, lost no opportunity of sneering at John Bright, and in his turn received no quarter from the apostle of non-intervention and the friend of the unenfranchised masses.

As his wife cared little for London life, John Bright always lived during the Parliamentary session in bachelor quarters, and probably never gave a dinner party in his life. For many years before his death he occupied a set of rooms in Piccadilly facing the Green Park. Here he breakfasted and smoked his morning cigar, and at ten o'clock he was accessible to every one who chose to call. He received his visitors in a grey dressing-gown. All were welcome; and it may be safely said that his kindest smile was for the struggling author, or for the American who sought him as the friend of America, often without other introduction than his nationality. Even on the streets of London his well-known face invited recognition; and many a time his hand was shaken by unknown travelers from the United States, men or women, whose names he never knew and whom he never saw again.

Whilst he held Cabinet office he transacted with his secretary, when his levee was over, his daily business as Minister of the Crown; after which he would sit down at a little old-fashioned desk and write his private letters, twenty or thirty every day. These were often penned on half sheets of paper, torn from the notes of his too numerous correspondents; but even in this scrappy guise they were models of neatness, written in a small and delicate hand. He never used an amanuensis or left the letter of a stranger unanswered. So punctilious was he in this courtesy that he not only thanked the people who forwarded him presentation copies of their books, but conscientiously read every volume. He even recognized the needs of autograph hunters, and he used to send them a few favorite hints of Whittier's with his signature below.

The portrait in the Reform Club by Frank Holl shows only the fighting side of the statesman whose social qualities found

there for over forty years their most congenial surroundings. A large part of John Bright's idle hours in London were spent in the old club house in Pall Mall so intimately associated with the history of English Liberalism. Though he was an habitual diner-out, he made but a pretence of the evening meal. After glancing over the day's papers at the club, he liked to make a dinner there in the afternoon, after which he would stroll from table to table in casual talk, and finally to the smoking-room or billiard-room, always surrounded by a knot of friends. Thus the day passed until it was time to go down to the House of Commons or out to dinner. Billiards was the only game he cared for, and if he never made a good player it was not for want of practice. By an unwritten but sacred law, the "little billiard-room" at the Reform Club was as absolutely at his disposal as was the corner seat on the third bench below the gangway in the House of Commons—a place in which, as all the world knows, no seat is specially appropriated to any member except, in some rare instance, by the tacit assent of the party to which he belongs.

As his influence in the country grew to be unquestioned, he became everywhere a privileged person. The Queen waived in favor of his Quaker principles the rigor of State etiquette. He had always shielded her name in political controversy, once from Tory attacks in her younger days, and also, as it happened once, from his own friends. Consequently, he was well received at Windsor; and when his relations with the Queen had become personal, he used to speak of her with peculiar respect. She was in his eyes "the most absolutely truthful and straightforward person he had ever met." In short, the man who for half a lifetime had been hated as a Jacobin by the self-styled respectable classes, and malignantly reviled by the *Times* and every scurrilous Tory print which represented their views, suddenly found his opinions treated with universal respect. And by a singular fate, he who had created the Liberal party of to day, and placed it in Mr. Gladstone's leadership, was the man who of all others wrecked that party and its leader at the hustings by a single speech on Home Rule addressed to his constituents at Birmingham on the eve of the polls of 1886. That act was the closing out of his own history. His friendship for Mr. Gladstone was over, and he refused to meet his former ally on any pretext of smoothing over their differences on public affairs. As the political tide flowed

past his own moorings he cared less for actual life; but to the last he never abated the vigor of his invective against men or measures he disliked.

"There is nothing to tell in my life," he used to say to those who talked to him of a biography. "My speeches are my life." And in the copy of his published speeches which he gave to his sister Priscilla McLaren, he wrote the words "my political sermons." His judgment was true enough. No man ever achieved greater success in directing the public opinion and legislation of the nation. But ambition, wealth and social influence had no share in this. It was due to the power of his oratory, and this power depended, not merely on the classical perfection of his style, but on the religious earnestness of his motives, and the personality of the man himself. He was never spoilt by success. The Sunday after one of his most famous speeches in the House of Commons, on the administration of India, in which he first insisted on rational principles of government for the 250,000,000 inhabitants of that Empire, he took his seat as doorkeeper on a back bench of the Friends' Meeting House in his native town, as his name happened to fall in rotation for the duty. He lived simply and without ostentation in the house he had built before his first marriage, keeping the early hours of a country life. He died as he had lived, caressed by the little dog that had been his favorite, surrounded by children whom he loved, and with the consolation of a people's sympathy conveyed to him not alone by the Head of the Nation, but by tokens from the humblest homes. In a passage of perfect eloquence he left to the world his own story:

"I am not," said he in the House of Commons during the Crimean War, "nor did I ever pretend to be, a statesman; and that character is so tainted and equivocal in our day that I am not sure that a pure and honorable ambition would aspire to it. I have not enjoyed for thirty years, like those noble Lords, the honors and emoluments of office. I have not set my sails to every passing breeze. I am a plain and simple citizen, sent here by one of the foremost constituencies of the Empire, representing feebly, perhaps, but honestly, I dare aver, the opinions of very many, and the true interests of all those who have sent me here. Let it not be said that I am alone in my condemnation of this war, and of this incapable and guilty administration. And, even if I were alone, if mine were a solitary voice, raised amid the din of arms and the clamors of a venal press, I should have the consolation I have to-night—and which I trust will be mine to the last moment of my existence—the priceless consolation that no word of mine has tended to promote the squandering of my country's treasure or the spilling of one drop of my country's blood."

CHARLES MCLAREN.

THE GARZA RAID AND ITS LESSONS.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER OF FINANCE.

THE so-called Garza revolution against the government of Mexico, organized on the frontier of the United States, in September, 1891, is an incident furnishing lessons which I think should be taken advantage of, and to call public attention to them is my object and my apology in penning these lines.

It is well known that, as a general rule, the least desirable elements of two bordering countries collect on their frontiers. Smugglers, cattle thieves, fugitives from justice, people compelled to leave their country for their country's good, but who usually attribute their flight to political motives, and other persons under more or less similar circumstances, meet on the frontier, and they are ever ready to undertake any kind of enterprise, no matter how illegal it may be. On the border-line between Mexico and the United States, and particularly on that part of the frontier embraced in the State of Texas, these persons are not an exception to that rule. The inhabitants of that section are largely of Mexican origin, who have never amalgamated with their neighbors of that country, many of them ignorant of the English language and having very little in common with the rest of the inhabitants. Under these circumstances they are peculiarly susceptible to pernicious influences, and therefore only too ready to take part in disturbances of the peace. These people are generally ignorant, few being able to read and write, and they are easily influenced by unscrupulous members of their own race, who can appeal to them in their native tongue. When adventurers pose before them as victims of the tyranny of the existing home government, and know how to work upon their feelings, making them believe that they are coöperators in a legitimate, and even laudable, as well as remunerative, undertaking, they readily elicit their sympathies and support.

Some natives of the Mexican states bordering on the United States, who for some reason have been forced to leave their country (and it is possible that among them may be some who in good faith might be considered political emigrants, and who may even be influenced by patriotic sentiments, although these, if any, are few in number), establish themselves in the frontier settlements of Texas because they entertain the illusion that they can materially contribute to the overthrow of the government, of which they have declared themselves the enemies, and which they believe persecutes them. They think that such an overthrow will not be long delayed, and that they may at any time be called back to their homes. Hence they wish to be as near as possible to what they think will be within a short time the theatre of their services and activity.

In support of these assertions I will cite the opinions of persons who are fully competent to speak on the subject, and who are well acquainted with the situation on the frontier. Captain George F. Chase, Third United States Cavalry, who has served some time on the frontier, and who commanded the troops in pursuit of Garza's bands, in an official report made to the headquarters of the Military Department of Texas, which was transmitted by General Stanley to the Department of War, and of which General Schofield furnished extracts which were published by the newspapers of the country, in speaking of the Mexican inhabitants of the Texas frontier says :

"We are serving among people who hate and despise any form of government other than revolutionary. Yet they take pride in being citizens of Mexico. Still the government of Mexico is not satisfactory to them, and they are now endeavoring to overthrow it and put their own people in power with the fortunes they have accumulated on our side of the Rio Grande."

In his report, forwarding that of Captain Chase to the Department of War, General Stanley in referring to this subject, says :

"It must be remembered that a very large percentage of the population along the Texas border is made up of escaped convicts and murderers from Mexico, and of Mexican citizens who have no regard for law and order, and who readily join in any excitement in opposition to government authority. A singular feature of the situation is that the rich Mexicans who own and control large ranches in Southern Texas, and claim every protection of the American government, give their influence and furnish means to support any measure against our government or that of Mexico."

Still more explicit is the opinion of the Hon. Thomas Ryan, United States Minister to Mexico, as he expressed it in the Chicago *Evening News* of March 11, 1892. It reads:

"The fact that the band (Garza's) is but a collection of cheap marauders, organized within the United States boundary, makes the Mexican people laugh at the exaggerated reports. Were it not that they operated along the boundary and talked revolution, the press would regard the marauders as no more than a band of train robbers."

Unfortunately the boundary line between Mexico and the United States used to be one of the places where revolutions against the Mexican government could be most easily organized. The results of these revolutions were as varied as the circumstances under which they were initiated and the personal antecedents and conditions of the leaders who headed them.

For some time the plans of the Mexican malcontents had not assumed a tangible shape, when about two years ago one Francisco Ruiz Sandoval, a Mexican by birth, and a man of turbulent disposition, who has taken part in several of the political upheavals which have occurred in the Central American republics, aided by other Mexican emigrants living on the frontier, organized in Texas an armed expedition, which about the 24th of June, 1890, passed over to Mexican territory. This band crossed the Rio Grande in two parties, the first, composed of twenty-four men, near Laredo, and the other of twelve men, near Guerrero, in Tamaulipas. They moved around localities unprotected by garrisons for some hours—less than a day—and as soon as the Mexican forces ordered to pursue them approached, they returned to Texas. Instead of having the support of the Mexicans, as they expected, they found that the frontier towns of Mexico had organized and armed themselves for defence against the marauding bands. On complaint being made by the government of Mexico, the parties who had violated the neutrality laws of the country were arrested in *flagrante delictu*. They were tried in San Antonio, Tex., before the District Court for the Western District of Texas, and, notwithstanding that their crime was notorious, and that the proof was conclusive, the jury acquitted them on the 22nd of December following. Although this result is not strange when it is considered that a political character is given to such events, and that their perpetrators are held up to the jury as martyrs and heroes, it naturally served as a great stimulus for further movements of a like nature, as in the Garza case.

A man named Catarino E. Garza, a restless and wayward character, whose only education appears to have been that of a printer, decided to follow Ruiz Sandoval's footsteps. He was born in a frontier town of Mexico, but has spent nearly all his life in Texas, where he has committed various crimes and left a reputation anything but enviable. Taking advantage of the turbulent and discontented elements on the frontier, where many Mexicans had collected who, owing to the loss of their crops at home for want of rain during the last year, had gone there in search of work, which they failed to secure, he organized a band which crossed the Rio Grande into the State of Tamaulipas three different times. This man is absolutely unknown in Mexico. He has, therefore, no prestige or influence, nor any support. His posing as a revolutionist against the Mexican government, residing as he does in a foreign country, upon whose worst elements he draws, is as absurd as would be the attempt of a man born in the United States who having passed all his life in Canada was therefore unknown in his own country, to head a revolution made up of people recruited in that Dominion to overthrow the government of the United States.

Garza's first incursion into Mexican territory took place on the 15th of September, 1891, and was made by a party of twenty-six men, increased afterwards by twelve more. They crossed near Mier, and remained nine days in the state of Tamaulipas, making raids along the Rio Grande between Reinosa and Camargo.

The second expedition crossed over on the 7th of November of the same year opposite the Agua Negra ranch, numbered seventy odd men, and remained only five days on Mexican soil, having returned on the 12th. On the 8th it approached Agua Leguas, but the citizens being armed the town was not attacked. On Wednesday, the 11th, the Garza band was overtaken and defeated by the Mexican forces at Derramadero de las Ovejas.

The third expedition numbering ninety-two men was headed by Cármen Ibañez, as Garza did not accompany it, and crossed into Mexico near Guerrero, Tamaulipas, on the 20th of December following. On the same day, at Las Tortillas ranch, they surprised Captain Cristóbal Enriquez, who with a detachment of twelve men retreated, leaving two dead and two wounded, after having killed three of the enemy. On the 21st they were overtaken at Arroyo del Bagre, between Vallecillo and Parás, by Captain Pedro Reyes

with forty men of the Thirteenth Regiment who routed them. After scattering in the chaparral they retreated to the Rio Grande. Lieutenant Indalecio Sada overtook them near this river on the 22d, and they fled to Texas, abandoning three carbines and five horses. During the pursuit they left on Mexican territory six men killed, several stands of arms, forty horses, and a number of stragglers who were afterwards captured, four of whom died of their wounds.

On the last two occasions the Garza bands went as far as the frontier of the State of Nueva Leon. On the three occasions they only stayed on Mexican soil long enough to enable the Mexican forces engaged in their pursuit to come upon them. On none of these three occasions did they attack any town of importance, and all they did was to harass and rob defenceless persons on their march. Neither did they engage any considerable Mexican force, and whenever overtaken they fled, returning to Texas.

Colonel Nieves Hernandez, who commanded a regiment of cavalry of the Mexican army, and who was under orders to pursue Garza's bands, on the occasion of his two first raids did not do so effectively, and this accounts for their being able to remain on Mexican soil nine days on the first and five on the second occasion. As Colonel Hernandez failed to comply in these two instances with the rules of the military service, he was tried by a court-martial, which met in Monterey, and was condemned to death, which sentence is now pending on appeal to the Supreme Court Martial in the City of Mexico.

As regards the elements which Garza had at his command on his three expeditions, I should state that when once the Federal forces of the United States were closely pursuing Garza, and were on the point of capturing him at the Palito Blanco Ranch in Texas, belonging to his father-in-law, Alejandro Gonzalez, he abandoned his horse, his arms and equipments. Among other things there was found a diary in which he had recorded the names of the persons who had assisted him pecuniarily, and of all those who had pledged themselves to his cause, offering to enlist in his ranks, and various other details which throw much light upon the origin, scope, and purposes of his movements, and of the elements upon which he relied. From this it appears that up to the end of January last he had recorded as pledged to him nine hundred and ninety-seven men and two hundred and fifty-three officers, divided into eight army corps, of all of whom he con-

sidered himself commander-in-chief; that the money advances which he had received amounted to $19,640, and that the expenses incurred up to that date had reached $6,541.75.

Notwithstanding that according to this data he had more than a thousand persons pledged, no force one hundred strong ever crossed over into Mexico. The money secured appears to have been in the form of voluntary donations made by various persons, some of whom had, to all appearances, a remote hope that Garza's chimerical attempt would excite a revolution in Mexico, and that they could then reimburse themselves through the profits that such disturbances afford. Others gave him money as speculators and investors, and almost all came from the immediate frontier of Texas and Mexico. Only one sum, of $2,000, came from New York, the contribution of one individual.

General Stanley estimates in an interview had with a reporter of the Washington *Post*, published on the 30th of March last, that Garza had a force of eleven hundred men. Probably he includes all the soldiers and officers who appear as pledged on his rolls, but he says that only two hundred and fifty-five men took an active part in the movements. It appears from authentic sources that they barely reached two hundred, as follows: The band that crossed over to Mexico on the 20th of December under command of Cármen Ibañez, on the third incursion, had ninety-two men; the band organized in La Grulla, Tex., under the command of Eustorgio Ramon, had sixty men; and the band organized in Ceja del Prieto, Tex., under command of Catarino E. Garza, had fifty men—total, two hundred and two men.

General Stanley also said that it was Garza's father-in-law who provided the greater part of the money to further the ambitious designs of his son-in-law, and he believes that the latter will wreck the entire fortune of the former. General Stanley furthermore says that on Garza's rolls there were thirty-five escaped felons, who would rather die than be captured, and that one of them, named Ramon, had killed four men in a street fight in Mexico (Camargo); that he wounded another in an affray and killed three policemen who attempted to arrest him. This is the kind of men that composed the Garza bands.

Let us now see how these occurrences have been presented by the press of the United States: Garza's movements and supporters were not only grossly exaggerated, but battles were manufactured and

events that never occurred were invented, with the purpose of inspiring the belief that Garza's operations were of a serious nature and of grave import to Mexico. It would take too long, and it is not essential to my purpose, to enumerate all the ungrounded reports published by the newspapers of Texas and transmitted from the frontier to the dailies of the United States concerning the movements of Garza and incidents connected therewith; hence I shall limit myself to the mention of a few of them only.

Hardly had Garza begun to organize his bands when the newspapers of Texas, and especially the San Antonio *Daily Express*, which appears to have taken the lead and actually was his principal organ, published the intelligence that Mexico was all excitement, ready to rise up against the existing government, and that the country as a whole only awaited the coming of Catarino E. Garza to unite with his bands and overthrow that government. These bands entered Mexico on three different occasions, and at no time did one single body of Mexicans rally to them, and in no portion of the country was a demonstration made in their favor. The small body of men which Garza commanded was increased by the newspapers to five thousand, afterwards to ten thousand, and eventually reached the figure of twenty-five thousand men. The insignificant skirmishes—if they deserve that name—which the Garza bands had in Mexico, and in which they were always routed, were given out as great battles, from which they, of course, emerged victorious. Such news was not only published in the newspapers of Texas, but was sent broadcast from that State to all the papers in the United States, accepted as true by them, and was published and commented on in their columns.

A telegram dated Rio Grande City, Tex., the 16th of November, 1891, represented the encounter with Captain Enriquez, to which reference has been made, as a decisive battle gained by the Garza bands against one hundred men of the Mexican army. It stated further that Garza had not left Mexican territory since he entered it on the 15th of the previous September, and that during that time he was stirring up the revolutionary spirit in the states of Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas.

Telegrams from Brownsville and San Antonio, dated respectively the 18th and 19th of November, 1891, asserted that Garza was at the head of a considerable force; that he had defeated the Federal soldiers who were sent in his pursuit, and that he was

threatening Nuevo Laredo, when in fact Garza's second expedition had been back in Texas since the 11th of the same November.

The dailies of the 31st of December, 1891, stated that about eight hundred men of the Mexican Federal forces, who were stationed at Mier, Tamaulipas, under General Lorenzo Garcia, and who were under orders to pursue Garza's bands on their third raid, had rebelled, murdered their commanding officer, and had crossed over to Texas to join Garza. This was a story invented to create the impression that the Mexican army was disorganized and that the government of Mexico could not uphold itself.

A little later, and for the purpose of disparaging the Mexican government, it was said that Colonel Hernandez had been assassinated by the Mexican authorities, whereas he was enjoying, and now enjoys, at the City of Mexico, in the trial instituted against him, all the guarantees afforded by the Mexican law.

In the latter part of last January, when it could be no longer maintained that Garza's bands were on Mexican soil, telegrams were published, in which, without admitting the failure of his plans, or that he had returned to Texas, it was asserted that owing to the drying up of the pasture on the frontier, Garza had been forced to suspend military operations until spring ; that he had many followers, and that the whole nation would rise when he should again take up arms. This also was pure fiction.

The stories manufactured in Texas regarding the movements of Garza succeeded in greatly impressing themselves upon even impartial and thoughtful persons. Mr. T. C. Swope, a special correspondent sent to the frontier by the New York *World* to watch the movements of Garza, wrote that journal a letter, dated Rio Grande City, Tex., February 8, 1892, and published on the 14th, asserting that there were important elements in Mexico which favored a revolution. He based his supposition upon the supposed discontent with the existing government, and stated that any bold and intelligent leader could seriously disturb the peace of the republic. If this were so, why did the Garza bands on the three occasions they trod on Mexican soil, remaining several days each time, meet with no sympathy whatever ?

It was also stated that the Mexican government had offered a reward of $300,000 for the capture and delivery of Catarina E. Garza, and this report circulated, gaining much credence throughout the country. The truth is that the government

of Mexico never offered any reward for the capture of Garza.

As though these fictions were not enough the New York *Herald* on the 28th of February published a telegram dated at Kansas City, Mo., on the 27th, which conveyed the intelligence that one Frank Wilson asserted that he had been at the theatre of Garza's operations; that the latter was in the City of Mexico, from which point he directed the movements of his subordinates ; that he is a very popular man ; that there is much discontent in Mexico ; that the country was on the eve of a great convulsion, and that one of the members of the cabinet of the President of Mexico figured at the head of the movement.

In the latter part of January of the present year, local elections were held in La Ascension, Chihuahua, which occasioned a fray resulting in the death of one or two persons and the wounding of others. This fact was at once coupled with Garza's movements, and the *Times*, of New York, on the 16th of February, 1892, published a telegram dated the 15th, at El Paso, Tex., in which it was said that there had been two engagements in the state of Chihuahua between revolutionists and the government forces ; one at Temochic and the other at Alamos (Alamos is in Sonora, and neither did anything occur there), and that in both engagements the government forces had been defeated—in the first with a loss of twenty men, and in the second with a loss of eight. It was further stated that the whole State of Chihuahua was ready for insurrection, influenced by the clergy. This was also a complete fabrication.

With the same object in view, that of discrediting the government of Mexico, and of creating ill will against it in the United States, a telegram was sent from San Antonio, Tex., dated the 17th of February, 1892, which was published, among other journals, by the New York *Times* of the 18th, in which it was asserted that the house of Señor Don Enrique Vizcaya, Consular Agent of the United States in Mier, Tamaulipas, had been forcibly entered by command of General Garcia, the same one who was supposed to have been killed by his soldiers, the agent being suspected of sympathizing with Garza and of having arms and munitions secreted, and that the Vizcaya family had suffered gross indignities at the hands of the soldiery. I am in the habit, when I see articles of this character published in the newspapers of the United States, of requesting information from the proper authorities in

Mexico, with a view of bringing about the punishment of the offenders in case there is any foundation for such articles, or to deny authoritatively their truth, if, as generally happens, they prove to be false. Information regarding Señor Vizcaya's house having been requested, the story turns out to have been likewise manufactured out of the whole cloth.

I believe these examples, which I could multiply greatly were I to take time to record all the false reports magnifying Garza's movements, printed by the Texas press and communicated to and republished by the leading dailies of the country are sufficient to demonstrate that there existed the pre-conceived purpose, persistently carried out, to impose upon public credulity, causing it to accept as true the most improbable and absurd stories.

Different motives have been attributed to the movements of Garza. It was at first said, in a telegram dated at Laredo, on the 4th of January, 1892, and published by the New York *Herald* of the 5th, that from the papers taken from Pablo Muñoz, one of Garza' s followers, when he was captured in an engagement, in Texas, with the United States forces, it appears that Bishop Montes de Oca, of San Luis Potosi, and young Don Augustin de Iturbide were mixed up in the frontier movements. It is not true that this appeared from said papers, which were shortly afterwards published in English by the New York *World*, and which have been carefully examined by Mexican officials.

Any one acquainted with the existing political situation in Mexico will understand that the foregoing story could not be correct. Although it is natural that the Church party, which is the avowed antagonist of the Liberal party now in power, should desire the latter's overthrow in order to succeed in the government, the Conservative party is completely disorganized, and exceedingly unpopular on account of the defeat it suffered when it asked for and supported the foreign intervention, and it is, besides, fully aware that should it take up as leader so obscure and unfit a man as Garza, it would very seriously endanger its situation, without any probabilities of success. Garza, moreover, professes to belong to the Liberal party, and it is clear that he could not for that reason be chosen as leader of a Conservative party. If young Don Augustin de Iturbide has any probability of later reaching a political position in Mexico, it will be through the Conservatives, and, therefore, he must follow the fortunes of that party.

It has also been said that a syndicate of speculators, who wished to lower the price of Mexican bonds in London, instigated the disorder. Neither does this story appear to be well founded, for in the first place the news of those disturbances did not seriously affect the price of Mexican bonds in London. For the week ending September 15, 1891, the date of Garza's first raid in Mexico, the price in London of the six per cent. Mexican bonds of 1888 was from 87 to 88; and on the 31st of December following, when the third and last expedition had already returned to Texas, they were quoted at 85 to 86, which shows that during those movements there was a decrease in price of only two per cent. It is true that about the 19th of November, 1891, they fell to 79, but they soon recovered. Besides, since the routing and complete disorganization of Garza's bands, the fall in the price of the six per cent. Mexican bonds has continued, they being quoted at the end of February, 1892, when all cause for alarm had ceased, at 80. It is therefore more natural to attribute their depreciation to the general falling in the securities of all the Latin-American nations, which was occasioned principally by the revolutionary movements which have recently taken place with varied success in some of the South American republics.

No less absurd is the story that the instigators of those disturbances are citizens of the United States who have received very liberal concessions from the Mexican government, and who, it is supposed, encourage the disorders with the hope of bringing about the annexation of Mexico to the United States, thereby giving a greater value to the properties and franchises they have acquired in the former country. It should be remembered, in the first place, that there is not now, either in the United States or in Mexico, any serious element favoring annexation, and that it would be folly for private individuals to undertake it without relying on the support of their country. They would secure no other result than the depreciation of their holdings, and probably the complete ruin of their properties. Besides, from the entries in Garza's diary, which there is reason to believe are correct, it appears that although among the contributors are some who might be considered as enemies of the present administration of Mexico, there is not one who could even be suspected as representing any combination of any standing, whether of a civil, religious, financial, political, or military character.

Although the movements of Garza were unimportant, even insignificant, their practical results have been serious and far-reaching, on account of the importance given to them by the press of the United States, and they have probably been more prejudicial to the United States than to Mexico. It is true that some of the inhabitants of the Mexican frontier suffered robberies and extortions through the bands of Garza during the few days they raided the state of Tamaulipas. It is also true that the false news published by the journals of the United States regarding those movements gave rise for some time to serious apprehensions in the minds of such people as had no other source of information than the newspapers as to the stability of the Mexican government; all of which occasioned the inconveniences natural in such cases. But the principal evils brought about by what might be called the inventive faculty of the press reporters have been felt by the United States. Its territory was made the theatre of war, if the armed resistance which Garza's bands offered to arrest by Federal and local forces in pursuit of them may be called war. The battles, if it is desired to so designate the encounters, have been fought in the territory of Texas. The laws of the United States have been violated; peace has been disturbed in an important region of Texas, and the armed resistance of Garza's bands has brought about the death and wounding of soldiers and agents of justice of the United States. The alarm which those false reports produced, and which might have affected somewhat the credit of Mexico, prevented companies in the United States that are constructing and own railways in Mexico from advantageously placing their bonds in Europe in order to raise the necessary funds to continue their works.

In the quoted interview of a Washington *Post* reporter with General Stanley, that official said that those disturbances had prevented the sale of public lands in Texas, which otherwise would have been sold immediately. Mr. Ryan, United States Minister to Mexico, stated in the interview before cited with a reporter of the *Evening News*, of Chicago, that those movements had created alarm and produced a bad influence on the trade of the United States with Mexico.

The clearest exposition of the evils suffered by the State of Texas from the Garza raids I find in an editorial in the *Daily News*, of Laredo, Tex., of the 7th of March which reads as follows:

"Many sales of land have been stopped by the stories about Garza's revolution; tourists have been kept away; health seekers have not come; passenger and freight business has fallen off; railroads stopped; improvements and the emigrant have kept far away, on account of the Garza bug-a-boo. It is time to end this nonsense, and there is no true friend of this section of Texas who will not do all in his power to secure the arrest of this visionary revolutionist who thinks he can conquer Mexico by hiding in a hole in Texas."

The suspension of trade, one of the results of that alarm, has injured not only the merchants of the United States, who have curtailed their operations, but also the railways, whose receipts from freight and passengers destined for Mexico have decreased.

From this succinct and truthful narrative of the facts, it appears that a man, visionary or perverted, or both, attempted to disturb the peace of Mexico, without having adequate means to carry his design to a successful issue, and that his efforts in this direction, which found no echo in Mexico, would have been taken as those of a fool or a bandit had it not been for the importance given to them by the press of the United States.

The exaggerating and magnifying of the importance of that chimerical attempt has produced serious and far-reaching injuries, which are notorious, and there is no one from whom to demand satisfaction, or upon whom to attach responsibility, and this fact shows that the existing condition of things in the United States is such that one man can, in cases like this, cause numberless and grievous wrongs without redress for the injured party and with the fullest immunity for the authors or abettors. The laws of the United States vouchsafe no legal, diplomatic or other remedy for such evils. There is no redress for the injuries that the government of the United States may suffer through false or exaggerated publications directed against it, and much less is there a remedy for those that may be originated with like purpose or effect against a foreign government. This also shows that the desire of the journals of the United States to give sensational news, however absurd, carries them often to the extreme of accepting without reserve, and without judgment and due discretion, whatever is told them, no matter how foolish it may be, and this fact has greatly contributed abroad to detract from the reliability of the news published by the press of the United States, and if this evil is not corrected it will end in throwing increased discredit upon the newspapers of the country.

It is natural that a truly independent press, like the American press, should be very jealous of its liberty, and that it should not suppress the publication of any news. It is also natural that in dealing with political up-risings in Latin-American republics, especially when experience has shown that the established governments always strive to belittle, to the extent of ridicule, the revolutionary movements organized to overthrow them, it should publish news showing both sides of the question in order that impartial people may form a correct judgment. But it appears equally natural that journals which desire to publish truthful news, and are unwilling to become the unconscious tools of low and debased passions, should use discretion, and receive with distrust news that comes through persons who on former occasions have knowingly furnished ungrounded and malicious information. If an American journal is satisfied that the matter furnished it by news agencies, private individuals or special correspondents is false, it should naturally infer that if such agencies, persons or correspondents act in good faith, either they have not exercised discretion enough to distinguish truth from falsehood, or they have become the agents of illegitimate interests. Once satisfied of this, it cannot be conceived how the newspapers can continue to publish news of agencies or persons which make their columns the organ of illegal enterprises. If they declined to publish such news and refused to pay for it because of its falsity, it is probable that these evils would be largely corrected.

In a word, there are, to my mind, two points which deserve reflection and study: First, Is it possible to find an effective guarantee that those injured by false political news published in newspapers may obtain redress, since the means provided by existing legislation are wholly inadequate? Second, Is it to the interest of the principal dailies of the United States which wield such powerful influence in the forming and controlling of public opinion, to constitute themselves unconscious accessories of bastard aims and plans, to the material injury of the interests of the country and of their own credit and respectability? I would that others more capable than I should take up these questions, aiming to arrive at a solution which, while guaranteeing the fullest liberty to the press, will prevent it from becoming the agent and instrument of low passions, to the positive injury of social interests.

M. ROMERO.

ELECTIONEERING METHODS IN ENGLAND.

BY H. W. LUCY, AUTHOR OF "A DIARY OF TWO PARLIAMENTS," ETC.

MANY Reform Bills have been passed through the English Parliament since 1832, and the franchise is to-day so comprehensive as to seem practically near manhood suffrage. Nevertheless, the retreat before the advance of Democracy has been slow and stubborn, and during its progress the classes have been able here and there to plant stockades that still resist the forward rush of the masses. With a population that almost touches thirty-eight millions the register of voters for the United Kingdom just exceeds six millions. How far this falls short of manhood suffrage will appear from the fact that there are eight million families tabulated in the census figures, and it may be presumed that each, whether in the case of father or elder brother, includes a male adult.

But the statement that there are six millions on the register far exceeds the number of individuals who have a vote. Plural voting, one of the anomalies the Liberals are pledged to remove at the earliest opportunity, is still legalized and is widely availed of. In one of his speeches in the recent Midlothian campaign Mr. Gladstone cited a case, brought under his notice on indisputable authority, where a single man possessed forty votes. As some people give themselves up to the craze of collecting china or first editions of books, this gentleman had devoted time and money to the acquisition of this rare, probably unique, collection of Parliamentary votes. The enterprise was one involving the exercise of much skill and management. The connoisseur would have ever to bear in mind the strictly marked limit of time within which a general election is completed. The statute sets forth that in boroughs an election must take place within nine days (exclusive

of Sunday) from the receipt of the writ. In counties the first possible day for polling is the seventh after receiving the writ, the last day being the seventeenth. Since it would be no use to possess a vote unless it were available, the collector, it will appear, must needs bear in mind these considerations, and must so arrange the area of his possession that, with ordinary luck in the way of avoiding the clashing of dates, he may cover the whole ground within the limit of nine days for the boroughs and sixteen for the counties. As the Liberals intend, when their chance comes, not only to establish the principle of "One man, One vote," but to fix all the polling at a general election to take place on one day, plural votes are already a drug in the market, and will presently become of as little value as albums of old postage-stamps and other curios that have had their day.

This possibility of six million electors exercising the franchise, inadequate as it is in comparison to the population, shows an immense advance on the state of things existing so recently as 1859. Speaking in that year Mr. Bright stated that the so-called appeal to the country which had taken place in the previous year was actually an appeal to 800,000 men, whilst, as the total of the poll showed, not more than half the number responded. The electorate were, at that time even more heavily than now, hampered by the stockades alluded to. The most formidable of these is found in the regulations of the register, which are evidently designed to limit as far as possible the opportunities of the masses. Both of the great political parties engage paid agents to look after the register in the various constituencies. By these persons acting in the interest of their several parties, omissions made by the overseers in the duty of placing properly qualified electors on the register are to a great extent corrected. But the stipulations as to date which hem in the register practically disfranchise a large proportion of the working classes. In the general election which has just taken place in England no man was able to vote unless he had occupied and paid rates for a house during the full period of twelve months ending the 15th of July, 1891. This means—the date of occupation commencing in July, 1890—that a man must have been a resident for fully two years in the same electoral district if he would exercise the franchise understood to be his birthright. The laboring population of England is ever shifting as work fails in one place and promise of it beckons from another.

The consequence is that in considering the tactics of a general election it is always found desirable in the Conservative interest to fix the date for a late period of the year, when the voting must needs be on an old register. This is another wheel in the electoral machinery which the Liberals propose to oil when they come into power.

Household suffrage is the basis of parliamentary franchise alike in counties and boroughs. In the counties there are also leasehold and copyhold franchises and for freehold property of forty shillings value and upwards. In Plantagenet days Parliaments were annual or even oftener. In 1694 a Triennial Act was passed and was some twenty years later repealed in favor of the Septennial Act which at this day covers the duration of the life of Parliament. Shorter Parliaments is another plank in the Liberal programme drawn up and subscribed at Newcastle this year. But though Parliaments may sit the full term of seven years they never do, the occasions being rare when a period of six years is exceeded.

When Parliament is sitting by-elections follow upon vacancies created by various causes, such as death, promotion to peerage, acceptance of office within direct gift of the Crown, or, as has happened in two cases during the life of the present Parliament, by expulsion of a sitting member. There was a time, strange as it appears in this day, when election to serve in Parliament was regarded as a drudgery, to be avoided at any cost. Thence arose the stipulation that no duly-elected member may at his own will retire from his place in the Legislature. This law is evaded by another clause of the statute, which vacates a seat upon the acceptance by a member of a place of profit under the Crown. Thus when a member wishes, for private reasons, to resign his seat, he makes formal application to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the post of Steward of the Chiltern Hundreds, a shadowy office, his being formally established in which *ipso facto* forfeits his seat in Parliament, and if he wants to get back he can do so only after reëlection.

In the case of by-elections the issue of a writ is moved in the House by the whip of the party to which the retiring member has belonged. It is thereupon issued on the warrant of the Speaker. There being no Speaker in existence when Parliament has been dissolved, the Queen in council issues a warrant addressed to the Lord Chancellors of Great Britain and Ireland, who in turn di-

rect the Clerk of the Crown to issue the writs. These documents are addressed to the returning officers in the various counties and towns, with whom, thereafter, rests the direction of the business of election. In boroughs the returning officer is the Mayor, the Sheriff acting in that capacity in counties. When a member comes up to Westminster after his election, he is not permitted to take the oath or sign the roll till he has handed to the Clerk of Parliament the return to the writ duly attested by Sheriff or Mayor. When he is brought up to the table by the two members who have undertaken to introduce him, he is always met at the corner of the table by the clerk, who stands with outstretched hand. Sometimes a nervous member, misconstruing this action, seizes the hand and warmly shakes it. Others find they have forgotten to bring with them the document for which it is extended. No one who was in the House when the present Lord Chancellor, after many reverses in the electoral field, came up to take his seat for Launceston, will forget the scene. Sir Hardinge Giffard, as he then was, had mislaid the return to the writ. He was positive he had brought it down to the House, and felt convinced it must be secreted somewhere about his person. Standing in the centre of a crowded and laughing House, the new Solicitor General proceeded to search in all his pockets for the document, producing out of each more miscellaneous papers than it seemed possible for a man of his stature to carry about with him. When in his hurried agonized search he had nearly buried the mace under papers, Sir Henry James, who had accompanied him to the table, returned with the missing document, which he had found under the bench where the new member had sat awaiting the summons to the table.

In the good old times nomination used to be an early and prominent ordeal through which candidates passed on their way to Parliament. A wooden structure was erected, a vast crowd assembled, and the candidates having struggled their way through were proposed, seconded, and made speeches in reply. These public nominations were perfect pandemoniums, fitly ushering in the state of things that used to exist, and which is found pictured in the plates of Gilroy and Cruikshank, and in the account of the Eatonswill election, which, extravagant as it seems, was merely a transcript from Charles Dickens' note-book as a newspaper reporter. Much more recent memory recalls this cu-

rious custom. I have a vivid recollection of an election in Shropshire, in the general elections of 1865, on a description of which for a local newspaper I tried my prentice hand. One of the candidates was Sir Baldwin Leighton, father of the present baronet. He had affronted public opinion in some action taken in his magisterial capacity touching possession of certain rabbit skins. When he presented himself in front of the platform to accept the nomination just moved and seconded, the sky suddenly became obscured by a sudden shower of rabbit skins, with which the hapless candidate was pelted throughout the discreetly brief continuance of his address.

Under existing regulations the nomination of a parliamentary candidate is a dull, business-like arrangement, got over in a few minutes in a back room in the town or county hall. Any two registered electors may propose and second a candidate, using nomination forms provided by the returning officer. No nomination paper will be accepted unless, in addition to the mover and seconder, eight other registered electors of the constituency sign it. Only the candidate, his proposer, seconder, and one other person, usually his agent, may attend the nomination which must be accomplished before noon on the appointed day.

As the elector is deprived of the interest and excitement of the old nomination day, so is the act of voting reduced to the simplest proportion. The voting is taken by ballot in much the same way as the process is accomplished in the United States. The system is scarcely yet acclimatized in this country, more especially in the rural districts, where the voter, long accustomed to domination of parson and squire, has difficulty in believing that their eye is not upon him even in the recesses of the polling place. There are, however, shining exceptions to this density of perception. One is recorded from a Hampshire polling place. The elector, a plowman, was brought up to the polling place by his employer, a farmer, enthusiastically attached to Conservative colors. "Be sure," he said, "to mark the cross against the name at the top of the paper, and you'll be all right." "Did you do it?" he asked, when the voter came out of the polling booth. "Yes," said the plowman, "but (this explanation was reserved for the private ear of another audience) I first took care to turn the paper upside down." Another voter, of the Roman Catholic faith, was instructed that on going to the poll he should

put an X opposite the name of Mr. Fraser Mackintosh, one of the candidates. Misunderstanding the injunction, he, on entering the booth, alarmed the polling sheriff by dropping on his knees, crossing himself, and crying aloud on "Fraser Mackintosh!"

The direct effect of recent legislation, reforming the electoral system, has been to reduce the cost of elections. History is full of records of ruinous contests taking place under the ancient system. Among the most famous elections in the old style was that which took place in Westminster in 1784, when Fox offered himself for reëlection. This was the contest in which the Duchess of Devonshire took so prominent and influential a part. Walpole has a good deal to say on the subject. Writing under date of April 13, in this year, he says: "During her canvass the Duchess made no scruple of visiting the humblest of the electors, dazzling and enchanting them by the fascination of her manner, the power of her beauty, and the influence of her high rank, sometimes carrying off to the hustings (meaning the polling place) the meanest mechanic in her own carriage." Six days later Lord Cornwallis writes: "The Duchess of Devonshire is indefatigable in her canvass for Fox. She was in the most blackguard houses in Long Acre by eight o'clock in the morning." It was in this neighborhood that a butcher, whose vote was not to be purchased on other terms, sold it for a kiss from the gracious dame, who to this day lives on Gainsborough's canvass.

Another person who took scarcely a less prominent part in the contest was the Prince of Wales. It was said he canvassed in person for a candidate whose cause was dear to him, since it was hateful to his royal father and mother. There is no doubt that members of his household were engaged day and night in furthering the fortunes of the great Whig. On the day the poll was won the Prince, who had been in attendance upon the King at a review at Ascot, posted home and, wearing Fox's colors, rode up St. James street amid the acclamations of a Whig mob. How far partisanship was carried in those days is indicated by the fact that Washington, in arms across the Atlantic against King George, having clothed his army in uniform of buff and blue, Fox adopted those colors as his own, the Prince of Wales positively ordering a uniform of the rebel colors and appearing in public so distinguished.

For full forty days the polling lasted, during which time the

Strand and the neighborhood of Covent Garden were crowded with mobs who took each other by the throat whenever they met. What with the actual expenditure in money by the candidates, the loss of time to a mass of people engaged in the contest, and the general demoralization that spread, a Parliamentary contest at the beginning of the century was nothing less than a public calamity. Wilberforce first gained his seat at this same general election, 1784, coming in for Hull at a cost out of his private purse of nearly £9,000. Bribery and trading were then matters of course. Wilberforce has stated that he found at Hull it was the openly established custom to give a resident elector a present of two guineas. He got double that sum if he plumped his vote, and every freeman brought in from London to vote cost the candidate £10. There was then, as now, a law against bribery, but it was evaded by the simple contrivance of withholding actual payment till the last day on which an election petition might be presented.

In 1807 Wilberforce took part in another and more memorable and more costly contest for the County of Yorkshire. The fact that within a week over £64,000 were subscribed to meet Wilberforce's expenses shows how high party feeling ran. Mr. Weller, Sr., has given an interesting and what is regarded in some quarters as an apocryphal account of how he influenced the course of an election by disposing of a coachload of voters committed to his charge. But what took place at election times in Merry England at the beginning of the century puts Mr. Weller's modest story in the shade. At an election for Berwick the Whig candidate provided a sloop to convey a number of freemen from London to Berwick. The other side got at the skipper, with the result that he missed his way on a familiar course and, pulling in at a Norwegian port, the electors did not arrive at their destination till the poll was closed. Precisely the very same thing took place at an Ipswich election, a batch of freemen going down from London finding themselves at Antwerp; and at Newcastle, where another cargo was delivered at Ostend and not reshipped till the election was over.

All that is changed now, and parliamentary elections have come to be prosaic performances, the most exciting incident being the blocking up of Fleet street by a crowd waiting to see the result of the various constituencies flashed on a white sheet by means of a magic lantern. These are our present-day election

manners. One thing that went to the root of the matter was the strict limitation of electioneering expenses decreed by the Corrupt Practices Act passed by Mr. Gladstone in his government of 1880. A maximum scale of expenditure is fixed and any proved excess invalidates the election. Standing for a borough of 2,000 electors a candidate may not disburse, either by himself or through his agent, a sum exceeding £350. For every additional thousand electors an extra £30 is permitted. In the counties where the area is wider and the inevitable expense larger, £650 is the legalized expense for a minimum register of 2,000 electors, with an increase of £60 for every additional thousand. The candidate is allowed a certain amount of pocket money. But if during and upon his election he spends more than £100, a detailed account must be sent in to the returning offices. Within thirty-five days of the close of the election, candidates are required to pay all their accounts and send in particulars with a statutory declaration solemnly affirming that the account is full and accurate.

Another straight blow delivered at corrupt practices by this same act was the prohibition of the use of hired carriages for conveying voters to the poll. The Duchess of Devonshire, were she now alive and interested in the Westminster or other contests, might, if she pleased, kiss an occasional butcher. But she would imperil her friend's election if she afterwards conveyed the pleased elector to the poll in a hired carriage. So searching is the act in this matter that it positively prohibits gratuitous use at an election of "any carriage, horse or other animal, ordinarily kept or used for the purpose of letting out for hire." In one of the Edinburgh elections just closed a curious point arose on this section of the statute. An elector drove up to the poll and paid the driver his legal fare, one shilling; the driver was observed shortly after to enter the poll and record his vote. The question agitating local authorities, one that may yet be argued in a court of law, is, Was the cabman conveyed to the poll, contrary to the statute, in a conveyance "ordinarily kept or used for the purpose of letting out for hire?"

The process of parliamentary elections in the United Kingdom does not vary in any of its constituent parts. There are some local customs obtaining in one place and non-existent in another. But they are not material. For example, in all parts

electors have the right to cross-examine candidates coming before them at public meetings, but Scotch electors lay themselves out for enjoyment of the privilege with characteristic deliberation and determination. To the extent to which it is carried out north of the Tweed it is exclusively a Scotch habit, and has a quaintly expressive Scotch name. It is called "heckling." Up to the date of the general election just concluded Mr. Gladstone had escaped the ordeal, no one presuming to heckle him. At one of his meetings, held in a suburb of Edinburgh, the spell was broken. At Corstorphine, as the place is called, there is a local brewer named Usher, a stolid, dour man, who saw no reason why, because the candidate was illustrious, individual electors should not emerge from their obscurity and "heckle" him. Accordingly, when Mr. Gladstone had finished his speech, Mr. Usher rose with quite a bundle of manuscript in his hand, presumably containing questions. At sight of him the audience set up a roar of execration that would have made some men shrink into their boots. Providentially Mr. Usher is deaf, and may have thought what he heard was a whisper of encouragement. Moreover he, to common local knowledge, wears a wig, and Scotch "wut" broke forth in hilarious cries of "Go and get your hair cut!"

Mr. Gladstone at length succeeded in obtaining a hearing for his interlocutor, and answered a question about his view of the plan of campaign that should have sufficed, but impervious, implacable Mr. Usher went on. "Am I," he said, "to understand"—Mr. Gladstone was at this moment seated in his chair with hand to ear, endeavoring through the growing clamor to catch what he called "this respected gentleman's" remarks. He caught this one, and, leaping to his feet with catapultic energy, leaned over the platform rail and shouted in Mr. Usher's more vulnerable ear: "I cannot answer for this gentleman's understanding. I am responsible to Almighty God for the measure of intelligence in this skull," he continued, rapping his own, "but I am not responsible for the amount of intelligence Almighty God has placed in *that* skull;" and he pointed with a wave of infinite contempt at the interrogative brewer. Sitting close by Mr. Gladstone on the platform, and catching sight of his gleaming eyes as they flashed on the hapless brewer standing below, I never saw the human face and figure so perfectly resemble an enraged eagle clawing at its prey.

H. W. Lucy.

THE ILLUMINATING POWER OF ANECDOTE.

BY S. ARTHUR BENT.

A WRITER of the last century thought to discredit anecdotes by calling them "the luxuries of literature." According to his definition they merely gratify the love of intellectual indolence by their conciseness, while they feed the appetite for novelty by their infinite variety. As, however, the human element has become more prominent in historical composition, the biographies of individuals are as important to the student as the archives of a department of state. "Biography," says Carlyle, "is the only true history," and anecdote is of the essence of biography.

While the introduction of the personal element into historic narrative deepens the impression of events which the historian wishes to make in the reader's mind, the absence of this element divests history of its human aspect, and reduces it to a dry, uninteresting, and, therefore, uninstructive statement of facts. Thus Hume closes his account of the reign of Charles II. by saying that in the midst of wise and virtuous designs concerning Scotland, the King was seized with a sudden fit resembling apoplexy, and, after languishing a few days, died, having shown himself indifferent to the exhortations of the Protestant clergy, finally receiving the sacraments from a Catholic priest. Contrast this bald statement of an important historic event with Macaulay's brilliant description of the appearance of the court on the eve of the King's attack, a Sunday night, when grave persons who had gone thither to pay their respects to their sovereign were struck with astonishment and horror as they saw the great gallery of Whitehall crowded with revellers, among whom sat the King, chatting and toying with his favorites, while a French page warbled amorous verses, and courtiers were seated at tables "on which the gold was heaped in mountains." And thus, throughout the terrible scenes of the monarch's illness, the historian deepens, by graphic details, the impression he wishes to make of

the profligacy of the reign of the royal pensioner of France, while through the gloom pierce rays of the King's "exquisite urbanity," last glimpses of which are his apologies to his attendants for the trouble he had caused them, having been an unconscionable time dying, which he hoped they would excuse.

So well is this anecdotal necessity understood by modern historians that possibly the less scrupulous or more imaginative among them "have drawn on their imagination for their facts." Take, for instance, the pathetic incident known as "the last night of the Girondists." Thiers, in his history of the French Revolution, is the first to describe the twenty-one victims of the Terror taking a last meal together, "at which they were by turns merry, serious, and eloquent. Their leader, Vergniaud, spoke of expiring liberty in the noblest terms of regret, Ducos repeated verses which he had composed in prison, and they all joined in singing hymns to France and liberty." In the hands of the poetic Lamartine this simple repast becomes a feast of Lucullus with "the daintiest meats, the choicest wines, the rarest flowers, and numerous *flambeaux*, the luxury of the last farewell, the prodigality of dying men, who have nothing to save for the next day." The nephew of one of the Girondists unnecessarily protests against lending to them a sensuality that was neither in their habits nor to their tastes,—unnecessarily, because no such meal, repast, or banquet took place ; for their companion, Riouffe, who passed the night with them and survived them, says that, when they returned to prison at a late hour from the tribunal where they had been condemned to perish the next morning, "they passed all this frightful night in singing patriotic songs, only interrupted by talk of the country or by a sally of Ducos."

No biographer can afford to neglect the illustration and anecdotes of everyday life, for they may serve his purpose more successfully than the most elaborate analysis. Without the use of anecdote it is, therefore, impossible to attempt biography, and when a biographer mentions a peculiar characteristic, an anecdote may justify his statement and confirm its accuracy. Thus one may read that Adam Smith was remarkably absent-minded. No one will doubt this when told that once having to sign his name to an official document the great economist produced, not his own signature, but an elaborate imitation of the signature of the person who signed before him ; and that,

on another occasion, a sentinel on duty having saluted him in military style was astonished to see him acknowledge it by an awkward copy of the same gestures. Busch, the Boswellian biographer of Bismarck, says that the Chancellor is of a choleric disposition. The least vexation is liable to provoke him to volcanic outbursts of temper, but the eruption rapidly subsides. He tells no confirmatory anecdotes, but Count Beust comes to his rescue, saying in his "Memoirs" that Bismarck once left the Emperor's apartment in a rage, and, finding that he was carrying by accident the key with him, he threw it into a basin in a friend's room, and broke the basin into fragments. "Are you ill?" asked the occupant of the room. "I was," replied Bismarck, "but I am better now." His passionate outbursts stand in strong contrast with Moltke's imperturbable coolness, which is well illustrated by the story in which Bismarck himself tells that, at a critical moment of the battle of Sadowa, he offered the great strategist a cigar, and Moltke carefully selected the best one in the case. Bismarck says he took comfort in thinking that if the great general was calm enough to make a choice of this kind, things could not be going so very badly with them.

Who has not heard of Macaulay's insatiate love of reading and of the prodigious memory which enabled him to pour forth at will the vast treasures of his learning? We appreciate the former when told that during his childhood, from the age of three years, he read incessantly, for the most part lying on the rug before the fire, with the book on the floor and a piece of bread and butter in his hand. It was hardly necessary for his biographer to add that he did not care for toys. He who speaks of Macaulay's prodigious learning and memory may single out the following anecdote from the many which illustrate it: Lady Holland, to puzzle him, once said: "Pray, sir, what was the origin of a doll? Where are dolls first mentioned in history?" To which he instantly replied that the Roman children had their dolls, which they offered up to Venus when they grew older, to support which he quoted a line from Persius.

We gain a more distinct view of Talleyrand's duplicity when told that, at Erfurt, where Napoleon met the Emperor of Russia to persuade him to join in overwhelming Austria, Talleyrand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, who all day long labored under Napoleon's vigilant eye to carry this object, used to visit

Alexander secretly at night and furnish him with every argument, reason, or pretence, which he could discover or invent against Napoleon's plan. Talleyrand himself told this to Croker, who repeats it in his memoirs.

All men, according to Napoleon, lose on a near view. He himself is no exception to his own rule, and the Napoleonic myth has been rudely shattered by the publication of memoirs filled with anecdotes which disclose the petulance, the rudeness, the ungovernable temper and uncurbed passions, the jealousy, meanness and mendacity of the conqueror of Europe. Chateaubriand, who wrote "The Genius of Christianity," was a man of impure conversation, and Young, the author of religious poems once popular, was a time-serving, place-hunting parson, "not at all the man of his own poetry."

But, on the other hand, men like to read of the weaknesses of the great, who are thus reduced to the level of mankind. This, fortunately, does not extend to fatal lapses from integrity, or calamities of fortune. The world will always offer to the blind Belisarius the obolus he is said to have begged at the city's gate. We would rather sit with Marius among the ruins of Carthage than with Tiberius on the rock of Capri. We accompany Aristides in his banishment, and join in the shouts which welcome Cicero's return from exile. We grieve to see Smollett perishing in a foreign land without resources from the works on which his publishers grew rich. We are touched by the sight of Cervantes lying in a dungeon and Camoëns yielding up his miserable life in a hospital.

Anecdotes may elevate as well as depress our opinion of men otherwise great. The well-known story of Goldsmith slipping into the mattress when he had given his blankets to the impoverished mother of five young children is matched by that of Lessing, in the depth of his poverty at Wolfenbüttel, taking home and supporting a man and a dog whom he had found starving on the highway. The weakness of much of Goldsmith's conduct is palliated, and our idea of the nobility of Lessing's character is heightened by these anecdotes which touch the heart of mankind.

We are by anecdotes made more nearly contemporaneous with great men than were most of their contemporaries. We are of the same time as the heroes of Plutarch, and have sat at the feet of Socrates and Plato. Demosthenes practising oratory with the

pebbles seems hardly more remote from us than young Gambetta shouting his seditious eloquence in a café of the Latin Quarter. In fact, our idea of certain men is confined to slight incidents or personal anecdotes. We never think of Diogenes without his tub, nor of Robert the Bruce without his spider. Even Alfred the Great is better known to us tending the cakes than founding Oxford.

Addison observes in the opening pages of the "Spectator" that a reader seldom peruses a book with pleasure until he knows "whether the writer be a black or a fair man, of a mild or choleric disposition, with other particulars of a like nature, that conduce very much to the right understanding of an author." He is careful, therefore, to give a detailed description of himself, and his remark is so just, even at this distance of time and space, that one can hardly open a daily newspaper without reading of a popular novelist like Tolstoi, that "he is a man of sixty, with iron-gray hair parted in the middle, sunburnt countenance, and ample gray beard and moustache." We also like to know the history and occasion of a literary work. We have not yet ceased to hear the chanting of the monks in the church of the Ara Cœli, which inspired Gibbon with the idea of writing "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." "The Vicar of Wakefield" is more interesting to us when we are told that it rescued its author from arrest for debt, while "Rasselas" paid the funeral expenses of the author's mother. This interest in authors extends to their literary habits, and the scrupulous biographer will tell us that Buffon sat down to write with lace ruffles encircling his wrists; that Blackstone wrote his Commentaries with a bottle of port wine before him, and that Handel, as he daily took up the composition of the "Messiah," offered a prayer that he might worthily sing the praises of his Redeemer.

Anecdotes and the sayings of distinguished men illuminate such diverse characteristics as modesty, self-confidence and self-conceit. When Marshal Ney was ordered to await Lannes in storming the heights above Ulm, he exclaimed, "Glory is not to be divided!" and pushed on alone. General Grant would never have said that, for, when he was made general-in-chief, he wrote to General Sherman: "How far your execution of whatever has been given you to do entitles you to the reward I am receiving, you cannot know so well as I." Jefferson's modesty dictated his

reply to the welcome extended to him as Minister from the United States by the French Foreign Secretary: "You replace Mr. Franklin," said Vergennes. "I succeed him," answered the American Envoy, "no one could replace him." Pitt's generosity was equalled by his modesty, when he said of one of Fox's speeches, "Don't disparage it; nobody could have made it but himself;" and Burke thought it glory enough to have "rung the bell" to Dr. Johnson. It was not merely the desire to turn a compliment which prompted Dom Pedro of Brazil to enter Victor Hugo's *salon* with the words: "Reassure me, Sir, I am somewhat timid." It was the humility of royalty before genius, the humility of Charles V. picking up Titian's brush, or of Philip IV. proud of having painted a decoration in a portrait of Velasquez.

A confidence in one's own powers need not pass the limits of modesty, nor will the biographer mistake it for arrogance or conceit. When Burns turned up the mouse with his plowshare, his impulse was to kill it, but, checking himself, he said: "I'll make that mouse immortal." Thackeray's fervor and hearty frankness are pleasantly shown in his saying of a passage in "Vanity Fair:" "When I wrote that sentence I slapped my fist on the table and said, 'that's a touch of genius.'"

There is a self-confidence, which is modest and yet wins battles. General Taylor once called a council of war in face of the Mexicans, who were much his superiors in men and artillery. When an unanimous opinion had been given against fighting, the General quietly remarked, "I dismiss this council until after the battle," which he won.

Although it may be difficult in all cases to set the boundary between self-confidence and conceit, the following anecdotes reveal an amusing self-assurance: Some young students made a pilgrimage from Göttingen to Hamburg, where Klopstock was living in his old age, to ask the author of the "Messiah" the meaning of a passage in one of his works which they could not understand. He looked at it, and said that he could not then recollect what he meant when he wrote it, but he knew it was the finest thing he ever wrote, and they could not do better than to devote their lives to the discovery of its meaning. "When I used to go and sit with Mr. Rogers," says Mrs. Kemble, "I never asked him what I should read to him without his putting into my hands his own poems, which always lay by him on the table."

Wordsworth quoted no poetry but his own, and thought that if he had had "a mind to" he could have written Shakespeare's plays, which led Lamb to suggest that only the mind was lacking.

A felicitous phrase or a happy comparison may hit off character better than a page of elaborate description. At the moment of the elder Dumas's greatest literary productivity, Michelet said of him: "He is not a man; he is one of the forces of nature." No other comparison could make Frenchmen shudder as Mme. de Staël's characterization of Bonaparte as "Robespierre on horseback." Carlyle dubbed the latter "the sea-green incorruptible," but the sourness, jealousy, and deathly cunning of the man are summed up in the comparison which Louis Philippe, who saw him sitting silent at a dinner-party, made of him to a cat lapping vinegar. We do not protest when Carlyle calls Byron "a dandy of sorrows," or Bulwer "a dandiacal philosophist," for the former phrase packs into a nutshell Byron's affected and drawing-room misanthropy, and the second paints the "lisping, slender and effeminate tones of Bulwer," of whom a contemporary said that the novelist's idea of a wife or mistress was a woman "who would sit on a foot-stool at his feet, looking up proudly in his face, and only interrupting him to whisper that he was the handsomest creature on earth." The well-known traits which gave Bishop Wilberforce the nick-name of "Soapy Sam" are alluded to in a comparison which the late Sir F. Pollock made after hearing him reply at a public dinner to a distinguished foreign guest, that the Bishop reminded him of the dealing of a boa constrictor with a rabbit. He first oiled his antagonist all over, and then swallowed him whole at a mouthful.

The absence of the anecdotal element in the record of some men's lives makes them but the shadows of names. Livy draws a graphic picture of Hannibal, but it is only in outline; it needs the filling up of anecdotes to give it life. We may believe him when he says that there never was a genius more fitted for the two most opposing duties of obeying and commanding, and also when he speaks of the great Carthaginian's fearlessness, his ability to endure fatigue, heat or cold, want of food or sleep, and his simplicity of dress; but when are added excessive vices, inhuman cruelty, want of truthfulness, of reverence for the gods and sacred things, of respect for oaths, and of a sense of religion, without confirmatory anecdotes, we may regard this summing up as the

pedigree of a hostile partisan rather than the judgment of a judicious historian. To Juvenal's question, "Weigh Hannibal; how many pounds will you find in that consummate general?" the answer comes, he is one of the scarecrows of history. "Hannibal is at the gates!" has been a cry of terror since Cannæ.

For want of anecdotal illustration Dante wanders like a ghost through the corridors of history. Carlyle says that his biography is irrevocably lost to us, "an unimportant, wandering, sorrow-stricken man; not much note was taken of him while he lived, and the most of that has vanished." Coleridge regretted that no friend of Rabelais had left an authentic account of him: "There never was a more plausible, and never, I am convinced, a less appropriate line, than Pope's 'Rabelais laughing in his easy chair.' Beyond doubt he was amongst the deepest as well as the boldest thinkers of his age."

Coming to our own time, Calhoun is hardly more than a name and an idea. Of him, as a man, very little is to be told. The Calhoun of the political stage, says Holst, his most recent biographer, "the Calhoun who ate and drank like other mortals, who laughed, chatted and sorrowed, who enjoyed life and battled with its great and small cares, is dead, and no one will be able to recall him to life, in the sense in which Webster and Clay still are and will remain and live as long as the American people cherish the memory of their great men." We have no anecdotes of the great Nullifier, the cast-iron man, as Miss Martineau calls him, "who looks as if he had never been born."

If anecdote plays so important a part in biography, and gives to history some of its most entertaining instruction, if our estimate of men is largely made up of little illustrative facts, it is important that these illustrations be correct, or our deductions from them will be wrong. "The disposition," says Froude, speaking of a certain scandal attaching to Julius Cæsar, "to believe evil of men who have risen a few degrees above their contemporaries is a feature of human nature as common as it is base; and when to envy there are added fear and hatred malicious anecdotes spring up like mushrooms in a forcing-pit." Anecdotes should therefore be used with truthfulness, discretion and good taste.

S. Arthur Bent.

THE HOMESTEAD STRIKE.

I. A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW.

BY THE HON. WILLIAM C. OATES, CHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

HOMESTEAD is a very comfortable-looking, neat little town of 10,000 to 12,000 inhabitants, situated on the left bank of the Monongahela River, seven miles east of the city of Pittsburg. Its inhabitants are chiefly laborers and mechanics of various degrees of skill, from the highest down to the ordinary laborer, with a competent number of small merchants and tradespeople. About one-half of the population are of foreign birth and represent various European nationalities.

About one mile up the river from the heart of the town are located the Homestead Works of Carnegie, Phipps & Co., the cost of which, exclusive of the ground, is near $6,000,000. At these works they manufacture structural materials used largely in fireproof buildings, such as beams, channels, etc. They also manufacture steel armor plates for use in the construction of war vessels. The 119-inch mill at which these plates are finished is one of the best of its kind in the world. The armor plate for the new Cruisers 9 and 10 now being constructed is manufactured here. The Navy Department has a contract with this company for 6,000 tons of armor plate to be used in the construction of our new war vessels. They also manufacture at Homestead all kinds of plate and do a general miscellaneous business.

Up to the last of June there were employed in these works about 3,800 men, including a number of boys. The pay-roll showed a disbursement for the month of May alone of something over $200,000. Wages have been from 14 cents per hour to the common laborer, that being the lowest, up to $280 per month (which was the highest paid in the month of May), a majority of the skilled laborers receiving $200 and less.

While the Carnegie company under its present management has been exacting, it has also performed many acts of liberality and kindness to its employees. It has at times loaned money to some of them to purchase lots and build their homes, for the use of which it has charged them but 6 per cent. interest. It receives from them deposits upon which it pays them 6 per cent. interest, the aggregate amount of which the last of June was $140,000.

On July 1, 1889, the company through its officers made a contract with a number of skilled workmen, through the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, to run for three years, or until the 30th of June, 1892.

The basis of that contract was a certain sum per ton of the products in different mills, and $25 per ton as the minimum price for 4 × 4 Bessemer steel billets, with a sliding scale so that if the market price of billets went above that figure the workmen would get the benefit of the rise; if the market price fell below $25 per ton, the compensation of the workmen would not be less than the minimum. When this contract was about to expire, the company, through its President and chief manager, Mr. Frick, and its chief superintendent, Mr. Potter, submitted a proposition to the workmen, which proposed a reduction of the minimum to $22 per ton of steel billets; also a reduction in some of the departments of the amount of tonnage rate paid; also to change the time of the year when the contract should expire, from the 30th of June to the last day of December.

After considerable negotiation the company proposed to raise the minimum to $23 per ton, and the workmen offered to take $24—which was refused. The workmen also refused to accede to the proposed change in the time of the expiration of the contract, on the ground that the company would have them at a disadvantage in any renewal of contract which would expire in midwinter. The negotiations were broken off on the 24th of June.

Mr. Frick, who is a very intelligent and shrewd business man, gives as his chief reasons for the proposition to reduce the wages of his employees:

First, That the price of steel billets, blooms, slabs, etc., has fallen to such a figure in the market that, in justice to his company, the minimum should be reduced (or abolished, as there was no maximum); and,

Secondly, That the improved machinery put in some of the mills

since the contract of 1889 doubles the output of the finished product with no increase in the number of laborers, which very greatly increases their tonnage compensation. This latter point is contested by the workmen and explained in several ways, so it would require an expert to pass a perfectly intelligent and just judgment upon the point. Mr. Frick testified before the Congressional Committee that his company has lost money this year, and he thinks the greater part of last year, on every ton of slabs, billets and blooms produced and sold by them. He claims that the McKinley law has nothing to do with this question; that it reduced the duties on all products, the like of which he manufactures, and still these are practically prohibitory, as the diminished amounts of importations clearly proves. He attributes the fall in price to increased domestic production.

In 1874 there were produced in the United States but 91,000 tons of steel ingots, whereas in 1890 the total production was 4,131,000 tons.

Our protective tariff laws, which destroy foreign competition, it is claimed, are enacted for the benefit of the skilled laborers employed by the manufacturers. The advocates of the McKinley tariff law during its consideration proclaimed its purpose to be to give the American market to the American manufacturer, and thereby to enable him pay his laborers higher wages. These promises have not been faithfully kept. Wages have in no case been increased, but in many instances they have been reduced. The promises made to the operatives have been disappointing. Mr. Frick claims that over-production has caused a most remarkable decline in prices within the last three years, and that this makes it necessary for the Carnegie company to reduce expenses.

The high protection extended by Congress to manufacturers, principally on such articles as this company has been manufacturing, has induced the investment of capital in the manufacture of iron and steel, until by this unnatural stimulus over-production has resulted. It disturbs the laws of trade—of supply and demand—and by thus producing more than there is a demand for, prices are driven down and a necessity is created for cutting down the expenses of the manufacturer, and it may be the wages of labor included. In this way the protective tariff disappoints the laboring man and becomes the parent of trusts, combines, strikes and lockouts. The manufacturer, no more than the

laborer, can help it, though he is largely responsible for it. He asks Congress for the protection he receives and must bear the consequences. It disturbs and disappoints labor, while professing to protect and foster it. After the breaking off of negotiations on the 24th of June a feeling of estrangement rapidly developed between the employees at Homestead and the officers of the Carnegie company. Messrs. Frick and Potter were hanged in effigy within the works. On the 30th of June the works were closed. On July 1st the striking workmen congregated about the gates and stopped and persuaded the foremen and employees who came to enter to go away. An advisory committee of fifty was raised from the Amalgamated Association. The watchmen of the company were turned away from the works ; guards were placed at all the entrances thereto, the river, streets and roads entering the town were patrolled by guards, and a rigid surveillance exercised over those who entered the town or approached the works.

When the sheriff came on the 4th of July and demanded to put deputies of his own selection in possession of the works, to guard them for the company, his request was declined, the striking workmen proposing to place guards of their own and give indemnity for the safety of the property, but this the sheriff declined because it would enable them to keep non-union men whom the company might employ from taking the places lately held by the strikers. On the 5th of July, when the sheriff sent twelve deputies to take possession of the works, they were not allowed to do so and were driven away.

As early as about the 20th of June Mr. Frick began negotiations with Robert A. Pinkerton, of New York, for the employment of 300 watchmen to be placed in the works at Homestead. On the 25th he wrote a letter to Pinkerton giving instructions as to the movements of the guards, who were to rendezvous at Ashtabula, O., and from thence to be transported by rail to Youngstown, and from thence to be transported by boat up the river and landed in the works at Homestead.

Arms and ammunition for the men were sent in goods boxes from Chicago by William A. Pinkerton, according to the direction of Mr. Frick, and placed on Captain Rodgers's boats at Allegheny. On the evening of the 5th of July Captain Rodgers' boats, with Deputy Sheriff Gray, Superintendent Potter and some of his

assistants on board, dropped down the river with two barges in tow, until they met the Pinkerton men, who were embarked on the barges. The boats took the barges in tow, and on the way up one of the steamers became disabled, while the other took both barges, endeavoring to land at Homestead before day, when the people would be asleep and the strikers would likely know nothing of it until after the Pinkerton men were safely within the picket fence surrounding the works. They did not violate any law of Pennsylvania ; but they knew that the hostility to the Pinkerton men upon the part of all labor organizations was calculated to produce a breach of the peace.

The greatest mistake made by Mr. Frick was that he did not appeal to the State and county authorities for protection in the first instance. He began to negotiate for the employment of the Pinkerton forces before the negotiations for the re-employment of the workmen were broken off. His company had a legal right to put Pinkerton men or any other employees into the works at Homestead as guards or otherwise, provided in doing so it did not trespass upon the rights of person or property of others. It is but fair to say that this he tried to avoid. The Pinkertons are professional detectives, and guards or watchmen, and in the latter capacity may properly be characterized as a sort of private police or semi-military force.

Mr. Frick should have first appealed to the sheriff of his county for protection. He gave as a reason why he did not, his want of confidence in the efficiency of the sheriff and the deputies he would likely have employed. The sheriff may be a very inefficient officer and lacking in that pluck and energy that is so essential at times to be exercised by an executive officer, but had Mr. Frick and his learned attorneys urged the sheriff and aided him by their counsel, although his efforts in the discharge of his duty were but puerile and futile, if the officers of the Carnegie company had joined him in the appeal to the Governor, and Mr. Frick had gone to him in person and laid the facts before him, there is no doubt that Governor Pattison would, as he finally did do in obedience to a sense of official duty, have supplied a sufficient force to enable the sheriff to take possession and deliver the works to the officers of the company, to the end that they might operate them in whatever way they saw proper.

Men of wealth and capital, as well as the poor mechanics and

laborers in this country, must learn to respect the law and the legally constituted authorities, and have recourse to these to redress their wrongs and obtain their rights in preference to undertaking to do these things by private or personal instrumentalities. If men of wealth and corporations may with impunity hire guards in great numbers to perform the functions of the county and State officials in protecting property and preserving the peace, its inevitable effect will be to bring local government and civil authority into contempt.

When Capt. Rodgers's boat with the barges in tow was approaching Homestead, just as day was breaking, a small steamer used by the strikers for patrol purposes set up a whistle, which was responded to by all the engines in town under their control. This caused a crowd to at once assemble along the bank of the river, where it kept pace with the boat, discharging firearms. When the crowd on shore reached the fence around the works they were temporarily halted, but tearing down a part of it they rushed through. A part of the crowd on the shore came down near to the boat when the gang-plank was pushed out. A short war of words was followed by firing on each side, which resulted ultimately in the death of three of the Pinkerton men and seven of the workmen, and the wounding of many on each side. After a brief fusillade those on shore fled in various directions, and the Pinkerton men retreated into their barges. An hour or two later, after having made the barges fast to the wharf, Capt. Rodgers took the wounded upon his boat, and with Superintendent Potter and Deputy Sheriff Gray steamed up the river to take the wounded to a hospital. About 11 o'clock the boat returned, the deputy sheriff still on board. He said that it was his intention to tow the barges and the Pinkerton men away, but the boat received a heavy fire from the striking workmen with small arms and artillery from both sides of the river. One or two of her crew were either killed or severely wounded, and at one time the pilot for safety abandoned his post and let the steamer drift, so that it became impossible for her to take the barges in tow, and with great difficulty it ran the gauntlet of the fire and escaped to Pittsburg.

At this time the strikers on shore were endeavoring to use a piece of artillery upon the barges, but they could not depress it sufficiently and consequently fired over them. They also poured oil into the river above the barges and set it on fire, but this

failed of its purpose, because the water in the river is slack at this point and the wind was blowing up instead of down the river. About five o'clock in the afternoon the Pinkertons displayed a white flag, and negotiated terms of surrender, by which they were allowed to take out their clothing, but their arms and everything else fell into the possession of the Homestead people. The barges were immediately set on fire and burned, and in their burning the pump-house belonging to the Carnegie company was also destroyed. The Pinkerton men now being practically prisoners of war, were marched up town to the skating rink for temporary imprisonment, and on their way, instead of receiving that protection which Mr. Hugh O'Donnell, the chairman of the Advisory Committee, in negotiating the terms of surrender had promised, they were brutally and outrageously maltreated. The injuries inflicted upon them, in some cases, were indecent as well as brutal. Whether these men were of good or bad character, the offence which they had committed against the feelings of the people of Homestead could in no degree justify the indignities with which they were treated.

The sheriff was notified and that night came down and took the prisoners away, informed Governor Pattison of what hadtranspired, and called upon him again for troops to enforce law and order, to which the Governor responded, as his duty under the law required.

I think that Mr. Frick, like many other manufacturers, is not infatuated with labor organizations, and hence is opposed to the Amalgamated Association and its methods, and had no very great desire to contract with his workmen through that organization. This was the true reason why he appeared to them as autocratic and uncompromising in his demands. They claim that he was too stern, brusque and autocratic to reason with them and hear their arguments. If the business of his company, on account of a fall in the market price of the products of the works, required a reduction of the wages of the employees, he should have appealed to their reason and shown them the true state of the company's affairs. I am persuaded that if he had done so an agreement would have been reached and all the troubles which followed would thus have been avoided.

Secret political organizations are inconsistent with our American republican system of government, because the public at large

has the right of participation in all matters pertaining to government. Laborers, farmers, and men engaged in any business, have the right to organize for their mutual benefit and protection, and even though their organization be secret that constitutes no objection if it is non-political. But no organization of laborers or others has the right of enforcing its wishes or the decrees of its councils by strong hand, setting at defiance the rights of others, or by violations of the law.

I have no doubt that the Amalgamated Association, which is, as I understand it, non-political, may be very useful to its members in many ways if properly limited and directed. While I do not assume it as to this association, there is such a thing as over-organization, to the extent of making the members thereof zealots, and then its unreasonable demands, like a boomerang in its rebound, injure its devotees more than the blow injures the supposed enemy at whom it is aimed, and in this way its usefulness is greatly impaired or destroyed.

The right of any man to labor, upon whatever terms he and his employer agree, whether he belong to a labor organization or not, and the right of a person or corporation (which in law is also a person) to employ any one to labor in a lawful business is secured by the laws of the land.

In this free country these rights must not be denied or abridged. To do so would destroy that personal freedom which has ever been the just pride and boast of American citizens. Even the "moral suasion" which the members of labor organizations may use to prevent non-union men from accepting employment must not be carried too far or it may become intimidation and coercion, and hence be unlawful. We must recognize the fact that in this country every man is the architect of his own fortune. A denial or obstruction of this right should not be tolerated, palliated, or excused. Our entire system of government, State and Federal, is based upon the idea of the individual right of every citizen to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is not the business of government to aid anyone in the acquisition of property, but it is the business of governments and their duty, each acting within its sphere, to protect the citizen, the humblest as well as the most autocratic, in the enjoyment of the right to his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Not to make property for him, nor to furnish him the opportunity of making

it, but to amply protect him in his lawful efforts to make it and to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

Congress has, from time to time, arrogated to itself the right to legislate in a manner and upon subjects of which it can properly have no jurisdiction, until the people have become educated to the idea that its powers to legislate are unlimited, and hence, whatever occurs that is deemed an evil, Congress is at once appealed to by thousands for a legislative remedy or relief. It is a familiar principle enunciated by every respectable commentator upon the constitution, and decided many times by the Supreme Court of the United States, that the powers of Congress must be sought alone in some express grant in the constitution, or be found necessary to carry into effect such powers as are therein granted; and that the states have exclusive jurisdiction of all local matters.

Congress, therefore, has no power to interfere by legislation in the labor troubles at Homestead, nor in any similar ones which may subsequently occur there or elsewhere. A voluntary arbitration law was passed by Congress, applicable to railroad strikes, and there is also one in Pennsylvania applicable to her own affairs, but neither of them is of any practical utility. Parties will not have recourse to that method of settlement, and there is no way to enforce the award when rendered.

Nor is a compulsory arbitration law practicable. Such a law could only be enacted by the State, and compulsory arbitration would be no arbitration at all, since it would at once be the exercise of judicial power.

Courts can afford remedy for violated contracts, but in a case like that at Homestead, where the parties fail to agree,—where they fail to make a contract,—if the State could invest a tribunal with authority to step in and say that the proposition of the Carnegie Company was reasonable and that the striking workmen should accept it and go to work, thus making for them a contract which they refused to make, and the workmen did not choose to obey the award, how could it be enforced?

No legislative authority can deprive any man of the right to contract in respect to his own private property or labor and without his consent confer that power upon another person or tribunal His discretion and personal right cannot be thus taken from him, for that would at once destroy his freedom.

The rights of property and personal liberty are secured by the

fundamental laws of the state and nation, just as they were by the English common law and Magna Charta, which the old barons, sword in hand, wrested from King John, at Runnymede.

The legislature of every state should be diligent in enacting wise, conservative and just laws for the protection of both labor and capital, so that demagogues may have a narrower field for agitation. Unless something of this kind be done, within the next decade we may reasonably expect a revolution and bloodshed which may work a change in the form of our government. Laboring men and poor people generally are much more interested in preventing this calamity than are the rich. The poor man derives but little benefit from a strong government, which would be the probable outcome of revolution.

Congress can contribute much towards allaying agitation by repealing all class legislation and greatly restricting foreign immigration.

WM. C. OATES.

II. A CONSTITUTIONAL VIEW.

BY GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

THE editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has requested me to give my opinion on "the legality of the employment of Pinkerton detectives in such cases as the Homestead strike." The inquiry relates to other cases similar in all material respects to the recent occurrences at Homestead, in Pennsylvania. It also involves the relations of employers and employed in all similar branches of manufactures; the relations between the owners of mills, factories, etc., and the workmen whom they employ. A great deal has been written on the relations of capital and labor, and written to very little purpose. It is, however, not difficult to define the rights of property owners or capitalists on the one hand, and of workmen on the other; nor is it difficult to determine what society—by which I mean the legislative power—owes to each of them respectively.

The matter of the Homestead strike has been very much simplified by the statement made by the Messrs. Pinkerton on the 22d of July to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate. It appears that for the past twenty years what is called the Pinkerton agency has been a private concern, which has furnished detectives for the discovery of crime, and watchmen to

guard the property of individuals and corporations during strikes. The men who have been so employed were not public officers or officers of the law, unless in a particular case they were made so by some public authority. They were like any other private individuals employed as watchmen to protect private property from the violence of a mob, from burglars, or any similar danger. They had the same rights of self-defence and the same right of defending the property of their employers.

Homestead is a borough on the Allegheny River, ten miles from Pittsburg. It contains about 10,000 inhabitants. Most of the male inhabitants are employed in one capacity or another, either as skilled or unskilled laborers, in the iron and steel manufacturing establishments. Their wages were exceptionally high. There exists among them, as there exists elsewhere, what is called a "trades-union." This is a body of workmen banded together for the purpose, among other things, of keeping up the price of labor, and, by means of a strike, of coercing their employers, when the latter do not accede to their terms. A strike is a concerted and sudden cessation of work at a given signal or order, issued by the authority of the union, in whom the power to issue it is vested by the members. Sometimes this authority is a single individual; sometimes it is an advisory committee. In all cases, when a strike is ordered, work ceases at once, to the great injury of employers and employed.

In the Homestead case, the existing agreement between the Carnegie Steel Company and their workmen about wages, had run out. Mr. Frick, the managing agent of the company, had an interview with the men, and offered a new scale of wages. This the men refused to accept. Mr. Frick then closed the mills. After this the workmen seized the mills, excluded the owners from their property by an overwhelming force, and prevented the employment of non-union men. Obviously, it was indispensable that something should be done to restore law and order, and to reinstate the owners of the mills in their property. The local officer of the law, whose duty it was to do this, was the sheriff of Allegheny County. His means consisted only of special deputy sheriffs appointed from the citizens at large, and sworn in as a temporary and extemporized force. In a population consisting largely of the striking workmen and their sympathizers, a force adequate to do what had to be done could not be obtained.

Thereupon the Carnegie Steel Company applied to the Pinkerton agency for a body of watchmen to protect their property. The agency refused to supply the men unless they should be sworn in as deputy sheriffs before going to Homestead. The account runs:

"The agency was then assured that the sheriff of Allegheny County knew that the men were going to Homestead to act as watchmen to guard the property of the company, and that the sheriff had promised immediately upon any outbreak or disturbance to deputize all the Pinkerton watchmen as deputy sheriffs. On that condition only the agency consented to furnish about 300 watchmen. A large number of these were regular employees of the agency, who could be thoroughly trusted for integrity, prudence and sobriety. The sheriff's chief deputy, Gray, accompanied the men."*

The men were sent down the Allegheny River on barges. It is immaterial whether there is or is not a law of Pennsylvania which prohibits the sending of a body of armed men into the State for any purpose. I understand that there is no such law in Pennsylvania, although there is such a law in some of the New England States. But the Pinkerton men were within the limits of the State before they were armed or needed to be. The boxes containing arms and ammunition were shipped from Chicago, *and were to be delivered at the Homestead yards.* These boxes, on board the barges, were not opened and the contents distributed until after the strikers had begun firing from the shore on the watchmen and it had become an evident matter of self-defence. Klein, one of the Pinkerton watchmen, had been killed by the strikers, and about five other men shot and wounded before the Pinkerton men began their fire in self-defence. Then it was impossible to shoot those firing from the shore at the barges, because the strikers had made a breastwork for themselves by placing women and children in front and firing from behind them.

The Pinkerton men were obliged to capitulate before they were allowed to land, and even then they were not permitted to go to the mills which they had been employed to protect. They were conducted by an overwhelming force of the strikers to Labor Hall, the place of meeting of the strikers. There they were made to promise to quit Homestead and never again to serve the mill owners. On their way from the hall they were insulted and brutally assailed by a mob, among whom the women were the most violent. They

* Statement of Mr. Robert Pinkerton to the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, July 22, 1892.

were withdrawn from the State by the agency, and thus the whole object for which they had been employed was prevented.

Under these circumstances, the sheriff of Allegheny County applied to the Governor of the State for a military force. The Governor declined to order out any of the troops of the State, until the sheriff had exhausted his means of restoring law and order by the appointment of special deputies. The sheriff made an ineffectual effort to do this, but the citizens responded in such few numbers that it would have been idle to rely on the civil arm alone. When the Governor was officially informed of this, he ordered out the entire division of the State militia, about 6,000 men, under General Snowden, a capable, prudent and experienced officer. The troops were marched to Homestead, and encamped on a hill that overlooks the town. It is only necessary to say, concerning this part of the history, that at the time at which I am writing there is every prospect that the strike will be completely put down, and thus the State of Pennsylvania will have rendered a great service to the whole country, employers and employed, capitalists and laborers.

On the indubitable facts of the Homestead case, which I have taken great pains to gather from authentic sources, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion, as follows:

First, That the owners of the mills had a perfect legal right to employ any necessary number of men to defend their property.

Secondly, That all the acts of the Pinkerton men at Homestead were lawful; and that, as watchmen, they had a right to bear arms on the premises of the Carnegie company in order to protect life and property, whether they were or were not deputized by the sheriff of Allegheny County; and that the agency had the right to ship arms for such purposes from Chicago to the Carnegie yards at Homestead; and that, in view of the attack on the barges, the watchmen had the right to bear arms and defend themselves; and that all their acts in firing in self-defence from the barges after the attack on them were legally justifiable under the laws of the United States and the State of Pennsylvania.

Thirdly, That the killing of Klein by one or more of the riotous strikers was a murder.

Fourthly, That all who stood by, sympathizing with and encouraging the strikers, or not exerting themselves to prevent

the strikers who were armed from firing on the barges, were accessories to the murder.

Having thus answered the question that was propounded to me, I shall devote the remainder of the space allotted for this article to the consideration of the duty of the legislative power in the States of this Union in reference to the whole subject of strikes. The stake that society has in all branches of manufacturing industries and in all the great lines of communication and travel is too vast to permit any body of men, large or small, on any pretext, to put a sudden stop to production, or to cause a sudden paralysis in the system of daily and hourly intercourse between different communities.

Unfortunately, there is one embarrassing difficulty. Whenever such a disturbance as that at Homestead occurs, politicians at once endeavor to turn it to the advantage of their political party; and men in high places, who ought to be ashamed of themselves, are often found encouraging the strikers, for the purpose of making what is called "political capital." Mr. Carnegie happens to be a Republican in politics, and his works at Homestead are an eminent instance of the beneficial effect of a protective tariff on the interests of American manufacturers and American laborers. For this reason, Democratic papers and politicians of free trade proclivities take the side of the strikers and endeavor to excite hatred of Mr. Carnegie and his business associates. On the other hand, some Republican papers and politicians are prone to charge the Democratic executive of Pennsylvania with pusillanimous hesitation because he did not at once respond to the call of the sheriff of Allegheny County. Whether we shall ever be entirely free from this disturbing element of politics in reference to this matter of strikes, is problematical. But it is certain that the duty of society remains the same.

The first duty of the legislative power is to emancipate the individual workman from the tyranny of his class. Unless this be done, capitalists can afford no aid to the solution of any labor problem whatever. Of what avail is it that a mill owner or a railroad company is willing to make fair terms with workmen if the state of things is such that they cannot employ whom they please, on such terms as will be agreed to by the men who want employment? It is only by making the individual laborer a perfectly free man that society can do its duty to him and to those who wish to buy his

labor for a price that he is willing to take, and which it is for the interest of those who are dependent upon him to have him take.

In opposition to this view, it will be said that the individual workman is a free agent now, and that if he choose to join a trades-union and bind himself not to work for wages less than what the union permits him to take, it is his own affair; he is acting in his own right. There is a wide distinction between the physical power to do a thing and the moral and legal right to do it. Men have the physical power to commit suicide, but society does not allow that they have a moral or a legal right to do it. On the same principle, the individual workman should not be allowed to commit moral suicide by surrendering his liberty to the control of his fellow workmen. His labor is his capital, all that he has in the world, all that he and his family have to depend upon for subsistence from day to day. It is to him and them what money invested in real estate, machinery, etc., is to the capitalist. Deprive the capitalist of the power to determine what remuneration he shall derive from the employment of his invested money, and you do the same wrong as when you deprive the laborer of the free power to determine what remuneration he will be content to take for the employment of his capital, which consists of his muscular power and his acquired skill.

These doctrines may not be popular. They may not meet at once with universal acceptance. But until they are accepted and carried out in legislation, there can be no successful reconcilement between the interests of capital and the interests of labor; no adjustment of the rights of society and the rights of employers and employed.

In order that I may not be misunderstood, I will now draw the line between what it may and what it may not be permitted to workmen to do. Associations of workmen, formed for the purpose of discussing the subject of wages with their employers, of obtaining and diffusing information about the price of labor in different places, and of mutual assistance in time of sickness, are beneficial and should be encouraged. But the trades-unions do not confine themselves to these objects. They transcend the line which divides what they may from what they may not rightfully do. In this respect they do a double wrong:

First, They bind their members to strike when ordered to do so by the governing authority of the union. Now the right to

renounce an employment is an individual and not a corporate right. The corporate body of a trades-union should not be permitted to bind their members to quit work, as a body, when ordered to do so by the governing authority of the association.

Secondly, The trades-unions, as most of them are now organized, prevent non-union men from getting employment, by every species of intimidation, even by personal violence, and sometimes by murder.

This coercion of non-union men, however attempted and in whatever it ends, should be made a crime, and be punished with severity. It is contrary to the fundamental principles of our institutions. The Declaration of Independence says "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Be it observed that these are individual rights; that they are inalienable by the individual himself. We should not permit a man to sell himself into slavery or to sell his own life. He cannot alienate his right to life or his right to liberty. No more should he be permitted to alienate his right to the pursuit of happiness, by giving up his power to consult his own individual welfare, in obtaining the means of happiness; and by putting it in the power of those who are engaged in the same employment to take the bread out of his mouth. We have emancipated the colored race from slavery; certain portions of our own race need emancipation from a slavery that is just as bad.

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

III. A KNIGHT OF LABOR'S VIEW.

BY T. V. POWDERLY, GENERAL MASTER WORKMAN OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR.

THE principle involved in the Homestead trouble is the same as that by which the founders of this republic were governed in rebelling against the British government. To have accepted decisions, decrees, and laws without question, and without a voice in their making, would have stamped the colonists as slaves. To

accept, without inquiring the why or wherefore, such terms and wages as the Carnegie Steel Company saw fit to offer would stamp the brand of inferiority upon the workmen of Homestead. Independence is worth as much to the workingman as it can be to the employer. The right to sell his labor in the highest market is as dear to the workman as the right of the manufacturer to sell the product of that labor can possibly be to the latter. It is folly to assert that the workman has no right to a voice in determining what the minimum rate of compensation shall be. If the manufacturer is permitted to invade the market place and undersell competitors a reduction in the wages of his employees must inevitably follow. It was to protect the manufacturer as well as the workman that the Amalgamated Association insisted on a minimum rate of pay. The fixing of that rate imposed no hardship on the manufacturer; it gave no competitor the advantage over him, for the majority of mills were operated under the Amalgamated scale, and this of itself fixed a rate below which manufacturers would not sell. The minimum rate was therefore as advantageous to the manufacturer as to the workman in the steel trade. The question at issue between the Carnegie Steel Company and the steel workers does not so much concern the price as the right to a voice in fixing that price.

Individual employers no longer exist; the day no longer dawns on the employer taking his place in the shop among the men. When that condition of workshop life existed employer and employee experienced a feeling of lasting friendship for each other; the interests of each were faithfully guarded by the other. Now the employer of men may be three thousand miles away from the workshop; he may be a part of a syndicate or corporation which deals with the employees through a special agent or superintendent, whose desire to secure the confidence and good will of the corporation may cause him to create friction in order to demonstrate that he is vigilant in looking after the interests of those to whom he looks for favors. The corporation, composed of many men, is an association of capital which delegates its authority to an agent whose duty it is to deal with the workmen and make terms with them. The Amalgamated Association, and all other bodies of organized workmen, stand in the same relation to the men as the corporation does to the capitalists whose money is invested. One invests money, that is, his capital; the

other invests his labor, which to him is not only his capital but his all. That the workman should have the same right to be heard through his legitimately appointed agent, the officer of the labor organization, that the corporation has to be heard through the superintendent or agent, is but equity. This is the bone of contention at Homestead, and in fact everywhere else where a labor organization attempts to guard the rights of its members.

Every law, every right, every concession which the workingmen now enjoy has come to them through the labor organization. Philanthropists have spoken honeyed words for the laboring man, but he has always been forced to knock, and knock hard, with his organization in order to take what equity would have accorded him without a struggle if greed had not entered its protest. Equality of rights is what the workmen are contesting for, and because of its immense wealth the Carnegie Steel Company denies that right. It is argued that this trouble is between the employer and the employed and that no other has the right to interfere. That is a doubtful position to take. In a store, in a small shop, or where but a few persons are interested, a strike or lockout may be said to affect only those directly engaged in it, but in the present instance the case presents a different aspect to the thoughtful person. If the great steel plant were not just where it is the town of Homestead would not be the flourishing place that it is. The establishment of that plant attracted workmen to the spot; they built homes, raised their families, and invested every dollar of their earnings there. Business men, professional men, and clergymen followed them, and a community of well-behaved, respectable citizens surrounds the steel works. The workmen by their labor made the steel works prosperous and great; on the other hand they made Homestead what it is. The men depend for their support on steady work, and the community back of them depends on their steady employment. Three parties are interested in this struggle, the Carnegie Steel Company, the employees of that concern, and the community. By community I mean the whole people. Other towns have grown up as Homestead grew, by the labor of workmen, and each one is to a certain extent interested in the welfare of the other. The articles manufactured in one place are sold in another, and a mutuality of interests exists to-day which did not, and could not, exist years ago when men required but few things

to serve the every-day needs of life. The manager of the Carnegie Steel Company in asserting that he has the right to turn the makers of a prosperous town out of employment and out of the town,—for that naturally follows,—stands upon treacherous ground, for the makers of towns have equally as good a right to be heard as have the investors of money. If we go to a higher law than that of the land, the moral law, there will be no disputing the assertion that flesh and blood should receive more consideration than dollars and cents.

The Carnegie Steel Company and like concerns owe their prosperity to the protective laws of the United States. These laws were passed in the interest of labor. During discussion on the tariff laws it was never advanced as a reason why they should be passed, that capital would be protected,—the argument was always that labor would be protected. The workman has not been protected from foreign competition by the government. He has had to fight the battle for himself through the labor organization. Not only has he had to fight against foreign competition, largely attracted by our delusive tariff laws, but he has had to wage war with the employer for a share of that protection which his government decreed by law that he should have. Our government has enacted protective legislation in the interest of labor, if we read congressional speeches aright, but it quiescently allows the manufacturer to absorb the bulk of protection, and then throws its armies around the establishment at the slightest provocation when the workmen ask for what their government admitted that they had a right to enjoy.

What would have averted this trouble at Homestead, is asked? Industries which are protected by tariff laws should be open to inspection by government officials. When the managers of such concerns seek to absorb all of the protection the government should interfere on behalf of the workingmen. If we must have protection let us see to it that it protects the man who works.

At the hands of the law-making power of State and nation the Knights of Labor demand "the enactment of laws providing for arbitration between employers and employed, and to enforce the decision of the arbitrators." It should be a law in every State that in disputed cases the employer should be obliged to select two arbitrators and the employees two, these four to select the fifth; this arbitration commission to have access to all books, papers, and facts bearing on the question at issue from both sides. It

goes without saying that the commission should be made up of reasonable, well-disposed men, and that publicity would not be given to such information as they might become possessed of.

An established board of arbitration, appointed by a governor or other authority, is simply no board of arbitration at all, for the reason that the workmen would have no voice in its selection, and the other side, having all the money and influence, would be tempted to "fix" such a board preparatory to engaging in a controversy with workingmen. For either side to refuse to appoint its arbitrators should be held to be cause for their appointment by the Governor of the State. No strike or lockout should be entered upon before the decision of the board of arbitrators. Provisions for appeal from the decision of the arbitrators should be made in order to prevent intimidation or money from influencing the board.

In no case should the introduction of an armed force, such as the Pinkerton detective agency arms and equips, be tolerated. The system which makes one man a millionaire makes tramps and paupers of thousands. The thousands go down to the brothels and slums, where they sprout the germs of anarchy and stand ready for any deed of desperation. The millionaire becomes more arrogant and unreasonable as his millions accumulate. Victimizing and blacklisting are the concomitants of the rule of industrial establishments by our millionaire "lords of industry," and these measures furnish recruits for the army of greed when organized labor enters its protest against such acts of injustice as has made tramps of other men under like circumstances. The employer who is satisfied with a reasonable profit will not fear to intrust his case to such a board of arbitrators as I have described. The employer who refuses arbitration fears for the justice of his cause. He who would acquire legitimately need not fear investigation; he who would steal must do it in the dark in order to be successful.

Those who harshly criticise the workmen of Homestead should put themselves in the place of these workmen for a few brief moments of thought. Picture the skill required to turn out faultless work, the loss of eyesight which follows a few years of toil before the seething furnace, the devotion to duty which must be shown in order to succeed. Then step outside of the mill and witness the erection of a high fence and its armament. Con-

sider what it means and that it is being erected before a threat has been made or a disagreement considered among the possibilities. Think of the stigma which the erection of that fence casts on the man who works, the builder of the town; and then reflect that it is being built to serve as a prison-pen for those who must work so cheap that they will not be able to erect homes or maintain families in respectability. Ponder over the fact that when cheap men take the places of well-paid men, they do not buy carpets, organs, pianos, decent, respectable furniture or raiment, and that the makers of these articles elsewhere will be thrown out of employment, and that other manufacturers will be driven to bankruptcy because of a falling off in the demand for their product. Then read what Mr. Carnegie said six short years ago in speaking of the question of employing non-union, cheap men:

"To expect that one dependent upon his daily wage for the necessaries of life will stand by peaceably and see a new man employed in his stead is to expect much. This poor man may have a wife and children dependent upon his labor. Whether medicine for a sick child, or even nourishing food for a delicate wife, is procurable, depends upon his steady employment. In all but a very few departments of labor it is unnecessary, and, I think, improper, to subject men to such an ordeal. In the case of railways and a few other employments it is, of course, essential for the public wants that no interruption occur, and in such case substitutes must be employed; but the employer of labor will find it much more to his interest, wherever possible, to allow his works to remain idle and await the result of a dispute than to employ the class of men that can be induced to take the place of other men who have stopped work. Neither the best men as men, nor the best men as workers, are thus to be obtained. There is an unwritten law among the best workmen: 'Thou shalt not take thy neighbor's job.' No wise employer will lightly lose his old employees. Length of service counts for much in many ways. Calling upon strange men should be the last resort."

The introduction of an armed body of men at the outset was an indication that some man would be expected to "take his neighbor's job," and at once. The arbitrament of the sword was the first thought with the Carnegie Steel Company. The laws of Pennsylvania were disregarded in arming citizens of other States and assigning them to duty at Homestead. In that awful spectacle to which the eyes of humanity turned on the 6th of July could be seen the final abolition of brute force in the settlement of strikes and lockouts. What the law will not do for men they must do for themselves, and by the light of the blazing guns at Homestead it was written that arbitration must take the place of "Pinkertonism."

T. V. POWDERLY.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

APROPOS OF CHOLERA.

ASIATIC cholera, so called from the fact that it is a disease endemic in parts of Asia, is a malignant disease of the blood, caused by the presence in the intestines of bacilli in countless myriads. This bacillus, discovered by Koch, and named the "comma" bacillus because it resembles the comma in shape (,) increases by segmentation; that is, it divides itself into two parts, each becoming of full size and dividing again. The bacilli are given off in the discharges from the bowels, and cholera may only be caught by taking the bacilli into the mouth and stomach in some way. They are infinitely small, so small that I have no words in which to convey an idea of their lack of size. They may be carried in the dust blown about the street, but the media through which they usually reach human beings are the water drunk or the food eaten.

The spread of cholera, it being a purely infectious disease, and requiring the bacilli to be swallowed, is through the persons infected or suffering from it or through their infected clothing. How long the bacilli will remain active in a dry state is not definitely known, but for practical purposes I can say that any clothing exposed to infection is dangerous so long as the bacilli have not been killed. Cholera, like other diseases we call epidemics, spreads along the ordinary routes of travel. Each person infected becomes in turn a centre of infection for others, and the disease would therefore move from country to country like the widening circles in water were there no travel whatever. The universal movement of to-day, however, hastens its march greatly.

While cholera is endemic in Asia, and always makes its appearance during such great religious festivals as the pilgrimage to Mecca or the festival of Juggernaut, it does not travel to Europe every year. This is because the disease does not always acquire that virulence which will develop a germ of sufficient malignity to travel. Why this should be so I do not know, but all facts point to the conclusion that sometimes the germ or bacillus is of greater potency and strength than at others, and this is true of all infectious diseases.

The present outbreak appears to have had its origin at Meshed, in Persia, a resort of Mohammedan pilgrims second in importance only to Mecca. As the pilgrims dispersed they carried the disease with them, and had any country except Russia been in the line of march, cholera would have been kept out of Europe. It travelled to Baku, thence to Astrakhan, then up the Volga, infecting the cities on the bank, until it reached Nijni-Novgorod at

the time of the great fair. From there it went to Moscow. It is also approaching Europe by way of the Black Sea. The Austrian and Prussian authorities are on the alert, and have established a most rigid quarantine. It is probable, too, the disease exists in a mild form, although the distress caused by the famine in Russia will probably have the effect of intensifying its malignancy. It is doubtful whether the disease reported from Paris is cholera. I am inclined to think it is cholera morbus, which is also infectious, and therefore a germ disease.

The practical question which concerns us in this country is the danger to which we are exposed. This is not very great. In the first place the fact of the existence of the disease is known, and in such matters to be forewarned is emphatically to be forearmed. Second, the period of incubation of cholera is very short, being from a few hours to three days. Consequently, should any person infected board one of the ships coming here the disease would manifest itself before the arrival of the vessel. The advantage of this is obvious; no vessel could arrive here with cholera on board without the quarantine physicians finding or hearing of cases. The outbreak of typhus which occurred in the city some months ago was produced by people who, owing to the long incubation of typhus, passed quarantine while apparently well. Of course, the germs might come here in rags, but the chances that rags have of passing without disinfection are extraordinarily small nowadays. Third, to confine myself to New York City, the water supply is at present very good. The water shed of the Croton is uncontaminated now, and will remain so until the population becomes much denser. Ultimately New York must get its water elsewhere, for, should the water shed of the Croton become densely settled, typhoid fever and cholera would become serious menaces to the people who use the water. Generally speaking the water supply of American cities is exceedingly pure. As water and food are the carriers of the germs, it follows that these must be carefully watched should the disease find a lodgement here. It is most fortunate that the cholera bacillus can neither stand heat nor cold. A few days of sharp frost will stamp an epidemic of the disease out. Food must be eaten while hot and fresh from the fire, and water, in cholera times, must be boiled. The extraordinary freedom from cholera which has always marked the Chinese of the southern provinces of the Celestial Empire, living as they do amid almost typical cholera conditions, and with a disregard of sanitation almost sublime, has been credited to the universal habit of tea drinking. In other words, the fact that Chinese never drink water which has not been boiled probably accounts for that other fact that there are any Chinese left to drink anything. While this is putting it strongly, it is not an unpardonable exaggeration.

Should the cholera come here we must then see to it that all germs are destroyed by heat before taking them into our bodies. It is necessary, too, that the most absolute cleanliness, especially of the hands, be observed and particularly for those who handle food. The germs may easily be found on such things as straps in cars, balusters on public stairways, door knobs, money, and the like. I cannot too strongly state the fact that the chances of infection, were the cholera to break out to any extent, would be almost innumerable and that no amount of precaution, therefore, can be too great. A person whose hands in any way come in contact with the discharges of a cholera patient could easily infect hundreds of people by leaving the bacilli where they could attach themselves to other hands. There is another

danger, and one which is serious, existing in the common house fly. It has been shown that these insects can carry the germs about with them. One reason why food should be eaten hot from the fire in cholera times is because then flies will not light on it and all bacilli on it prior to cooking are killed by the heat.

In case a person is attacked by diarrhœa during a cholera epidemic two dangers are to be avoided. The first is that of a senseless panic; it is by no manner of means certain he has cholera. At the same time we must proceed as though he had in order to avoid the second: that of infection. All discharges must be disinfected at once. For this purpose a solution of seven grains of corrosive sublimate to a pint of water must be kept. It is well to have a large demijohn of this made up and to use it freely. Not only must all the discharges be covered with it, but the patient and any person coming near the infected matter must wash the hands thoroughly in it. In a word, everything in any way exposed must be disinfected. Of course at such a time a physician would be called in at once, and to him must be left the treatment of the case. This article is not designed as a treatise on the treatment of cholera.

So far as the care of the health goes, were cholera to break out, it is not difficult to give directions. Fortunately for us when we are in health we can resist disease germs even if they are taken into the system. The care for ourselves during a cholera outbreak is, therefore, merely that care we should properly take at all times. We must take plenty of sleep, a fair amount of exercise, eat very plain food thoroughly cooked, drink water that has been boiled and allowed to cool in bottles on ice, let raw fruit alone, wear light flannels, and in general lead as rational a life as we may. No precaution against cholera or any other disease equals perfect health, for with this we can defy it.

It is well here to say a word about liquor. Many people believe that brandy, if taken freely enough, will save them from cholera. That brandy has its uses I would be the last to deny, but, assuredly, one of these is not drinking it all the time when there is an epidemic of cholera to the fore. To those who have this idea it is far more dangerous than the disease, and for this reason: The one thing necessary is to keep the health as perfect as possible. Now every one knows that constant drinking weakens the person who drinks and deranges the stomach, and that weakness and disordered digestion invite diseases.

Cholera may be of the mildest possible type, so mild that a person is not confined to the house for more than a day or two, or it may kill within one hour of the attack. It is a disease which cannot be trifled with in any way, and were there an outbreak of it in the city, a physician should be consulted the moment the patient is sick. It is better to make twenty mistakes than to neglect one real case. It is also necessary in cholera time that when a person is attacked with any sickness, especially one accompanied by diarrhœa, that the patient, with the nurse, be quarantined at once. Neither should mingle with the other persons in the house. All cloths, vessels, or anything else from the sick room must be placed in the disinfecting fluid described before being handled by others. No amount of precaution is too great in this regard.

Finally it is well to notify the health officers of the place at once. This notification will in no way injure the patient, while it may be the means of saving the lives of that patient's fellow citizens. To my mind when such

diseases as cholera, typhus, or yellow fever are among us, he who, from a selfish fear of inconveniencing himself, hides the disease from the health authorities is morally guilty of all that may result from his act.

CYRUS EDSON.

LYNCH LAW IN THE SOUTH.

IN THE course of recent events, public attention has been pointedly called to the extent to which the criminal jurisdiction of the courts in the South has been superseded by what is commonly styled Lynch Law. Lynching is prevalent enough in other parts of the Union, but for causes quite obvious when considered, it has lately been more prevalent in the South than elsewhere. Consequently, it is not at all surprising that partisan hostility has availed itself of this fact to again seek to kindle the old expiring fires of sectional misconception and discord.

The effort will not be successful. If lynching is more prevalent in the South than elsewhere, it is because the negro population of the Union is congested in the South mainly, and because, in the last year or so, the negro there has violated the chastity of white women with such appalling frequency, and under circumstances so unutterably shocking to human nature, that the white race there has been goaded into a degree of excited feeling for which no occasion has existed in other parts of the Union. This is why it is that the attitude of the country at large towards lynch law in the South is so tolerant. Nothing can justify lynching, under any conditions not totally abnormal, no matter how heinous the crime, or unmistakably guilty the accused, or orderly the execution, or universal the approbation of the community. But the human heart is passionately wedded to home and the family and to female purity, at once their vital breath and crowning grace.

Of all the crimes that stir the profoundest emotions of the human breast, none are comparable, in this respect, with the grosser crimes against female virtue. In spite of every restraining precept, it is rarely that a jury, in any civilized country of the world, can be found to convict even the husband who has killed the seducer, who has inflicted upon him no injury to which the wife herself was not a voluntary party. What, then, shall we say of the feelings awakened by an outrage surpassing all others in the overwhelming and lasting shame and humilation that it carries along with it?

But the act itself is not all. Suppose the prisoner to be indicted and arraigned.

How ten-fold odious and maddening does the crime become when it recurs in a community almost with the regularity of the morning newspaper! And yet it is no exaggeration to say that such for some time past has been the case in the South. Neither age nor youth has been spared. Between the 29th day of April and the 8th day of June in the present year, outrages by negroes upon white children were reported in the public press from Florida, Virginia, Maryland, Mississippi and Arkansas.

So blindly irrational and overpowering appears to be the criminal impulse, too, that danger of detection and absolute assurance of an awful fate, in case of detection, have but little deterrent force. For instance, a short time since a negro was lynched, in a small village in Virginia, for an assault upon a white woman, and lynched under circumstances calculated to strike terror into every depraved mind. Yet only a brief period afterwards a similar assault was committed in the same village by another.

Nor, it is most painful to record, has one solitary negro of intelligence, so far as the writer knows, ever raised his voice in reprobation of the crime that is responsible for the vast majority of Southern lynchings. Conventions enough of the race have protested against lynch law. One delegation, encouraged, perhaps, by the advice that the President once gave the negro "to people" a southern state, instead of seeking the vacant lands of Oklahoma, has even waited upon the Chief Executive of the nation. But the writer has yet to hear of a single sermon, a single speech, a single paper, in which a negro has expressed the slightest sympathy for the helpless white women who have been abused by his race, in the South, or the slightest detestation of the inhuman creatures who abused them. Indeed, indications are not wanting of a disposition to view the matter solely from a race standpoint. Last fall, a negro on the eastern shore of Maryland, who had been captured by a single white man immediately after attempting an atrocious assault, was actually released from the custody of his captor, and set at large by a band of negroes.

Such are the conditions that have created a widespread feeling on the part of the white race in the South, however mistaken, that the most flagitious of crimes has become almost epidemic in their midst, and that only a nemesis, following the offence as surely and speedily as does the thunder clap the lightning flash, is adequate to the protection of their mothers, wives and daughters. This feeling will hardly be allayed by the advice recently given to the negro by a relict of the carpet-bag era, to resort to the torch and the dagger, though it will certainly receive no accession of irritation from the curious attempt to satisfy the demands of negro delegates, without arousing anew the sympathy of women in other sections of the Union for their suffering Southern sisters, that is apparent in the plank of the late Minneapolis convention, which denounces "the continued inhuman outrages perpetrated on American citizens for *political* reasons in certain States of the Union."

However this may be, there can be no doubt that the pressure of similar conditions, in any State of the Union, outside of the South, would produce exactly the same results. That negro, lately dragged through the streets of Port Jervis, and hanged by a mob of a thousand people, for violating a white woman, and that coroner's jury and that grand jury which were unable to secure a single eye-witness of the hanging, are as strong proofs as could be asked that there is no essential difference between white men in the State of New York and the white men at Nashville who, last April, passed around the watchwords "Remember your homes," "Remember your wives and daughters," and executed their purpose, though one of their number was shot to death, as he should have been, by an officer of the law. There is no little pith in the late remark of the New York *Herald* that, "The difference between bad citizens who believe in lynch law, and good citizens who abhor lynch law, is largely in the fact that the good citizens live where their wives and daughters are perfectly safe."

Why is it that the negro has become such an habitual offender against female virtue in the South? We say nothing of the North; though small, comparatively, as is the negro population of the North, it is addicted to the same crime to a degree altogether out of proportion to its number. We answer unhesitatingly, much as we are gratified that the incubus of slavery has been forever lifted from the South,—because the negro is no longer subject to the authority of a master, and is yet subject to no other form of moral dis-

cipline that can take its place to as good, or better, advantage. Wherever he is brought, as in the cities of the South, into close contact with the white race and its civilization, he has manifested some capacity for the acquisition of education and property. But, in the rural communities of the South, where his race is mainly massed, every year has seen him more and more estranged from all that personal relationship with the white race, authoritative or otherwise, that once exercised such an important influence over him, and, therefore, freer and freer to sucumb to the retrogressive tendencies of his own nature. During the Civil War, and for many years after the war, unsettled as some of these years were, he was rarely known to violate a white woman.

What does the white race in the South intend to do to put an end to lynch law? So far as this result is to be consummated by elevating the negro himself to a higher plane, the white race in the South can only say that it is already doing all that it can do. It has for a long time taxed itself almost beyond its resources to educate the ngro, in the hope that the expansion of his intellectual faculties might make him better fitted to sustain the weight of the exacting privileges that were so abruptly conferred upon him.

The best conscience and intelligence of the South can only promise that they will exhaust every effort to bring the lawless elements of society under control. Anomalous conditions, however, produce anomalous consequences, and unless the negro does his part too, there will doubtless be ample occasion yet for patience. The reassuring thought at every conjuncture should be that, if lynching is the wrongful and dangerous practice that it unquestionably is, the communities where it is practised will be the first to feel its bad effects, and will, therefore, be the wisest and most efficient instruments for its extirpation.

W. Cabell Bruce.

WOMEN IN THE FIELD OF ART-WORK.

The art-work of women now past middle life was mostly confined in their early youth to copying with a crayon point the "hatchings" and "stipplings" of French lithographs. Artistic taste was at that time nourished on such subjects as girls with birds in their hands, Italian hurdy-gurdy players, with languid black eyes, under plumed slouch hats. In addition to such sallies, young women employed leisure moments in painfully duplicating with fine lead pencils the innumerable leaves of trees seen in engravings, while some old castle or the round tower of a mill, in the portfolio of their drawing professor, excited great enthusiasm. But then art students were rare and scarcely found outside our large cities and towns. The mothers of the present generation of girls recollect well this state of things, and they can also recall the square cross-stitch done in Berlin wools then usual for embroidering slippers and lamp-mats; while a dog, cat, or lion, executed in the same way, was the theme for a hearth-rug or a fire-screen.

But our grandmothers were even more elementary than their daughters in their conception of art. When the young lady of that generation had finished her sampler in crewel-work, and appended to this bit of embroidery a yellow canary bird eating impossible cherries from a tree scarcely taller than itself; or had fashioned with her needle a willow tree overhanging a white gravestone, above which a mourner was weeping, such examples

constituted her artistic "finishing," and she was deemed fit to enter society or to assume, often at fifteen or sixteen years of age, the cares of wedded life.

Few people travelled abroad then, and Mr. Ruskin had not shown the part art might play as a means of civilization. Our present purpose is to show the lack of interest in art fifty years ago, when there was little enlightened appreciation of it outside a small circle of enlightened people who were the admirers of such artists as Copley or Allston, and to contrast with this limited acceptance its position in the United States to-day, especially as it affects women.

The large art schools of the country significantly indicate the direction art is taking. Among them the Woman's Art School of the Cooper Union affords a suggestive example; and its sister schools throughout the country tell the same story of the broadened intellectual life of women. When we allude to the schools of Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Washington, and mention the new buildings that have lately been erected for museums and schools in Minneapolis, Cincinnati, and Chicago, and speak of the art departments connected with Harvard or Yale, in which women have equal opportunities with men for study; to say nothing of the studios filled with art collections at such women's colleges as Vassar, Wellesley and Smith, we see how large a field art now occupies; without counting the myriad children now learning to draw in the public schools of the United States.

Genius is the rarest of gifts. But when we look back and see the portraits by Angelica Kaufmann, and the carvings by the daughter of Erwin von Steinbach in Strasburg Cathedral, we recognize that, here and there, among those who follow an intellectual life, there have been women artists of high gifts. But art which touches a whole population is better indicated on a lower plane than that which affects people of genius; and we find thousands of young American women now seeking to embody their ambition in artistic form. One observes in such a school as the Cooper Institute about four hundred persons devoting themselves to artistic study. Recognizing the necessity of thoroughness if they may expect success, the larger portion are learning to draw in black and white from the antique and the life models. The Art Students' League, the Metropolitan Art Schools, and the National Academy contain large classes of women; while in Boston, Philadelphia, and elsewhere the same conditions occur.

Parents of college boys are usually content to give their sons from four to seven years in which to prepare for the business of life. Many women allow themselves four years to study art, and often they take a longer time; but it most frequently happens that they have themselves earned the money to defray the expense of their education, differing in this respect from their more favored brothers.

The practice of any branch of knowledge is tantamount to its continued study. But for the first elements of drawing or of cutting blocks for engraving, or pen-and-ink work for etching and illustrating, a long apprenticeship is first requisite.

We have seen how girls in the last generation found their examples of art in the portfolio of their teacher. Illustrated magazines, which in themselves are now a liberal education, had at that time no existence. Good engravings were then rare, and photography had not been dreamed of. Now, girls can dream over the Sistine Madonna in a photograph which gives nearly the full impression of the original, while an etching from Turner echoes the sentiment of that artist.

The paintings of more than two hundred women in a late exhibition of the Royal Academy hung side by side with those of eleven hundred male contributors. Visitors to this English gallery may recall the portraits by Mrs. Jopling, Mrs. Perugini, or Mrs. Stillman as among the best works there. Justice concedes that these English women rank well with men.

Fine paintings are few, compared with the multitude of articles in porcelain, carvings, or ornamental designs, designated as industrial art. One phase of art expresses itself through a small class of engravers, where delicate taste and deft handicraft appear. Here are found the principal compositions of Mrs. Mary Hallock Foote. In these she depicts remote Western life and the arid scenery of the desert where the cactus protrudes above long stretches of sand. Such a landscape forms the setting of rough Mexicans or Indians, varied by the soft-haired women and children of the Eastern States. These illustrations form a chief attraction of some of our most prominent periodicals.

But there is a more frequent type of artistic woman, composed of those without aptitude for untried paths, who are skilful in developing on the the block the "tone," "values," and graces of composition which other artists have originated. It is interesting to observe a young girl at work on a block of wood, five or six inches square, resting on its leather cushion, on which a landscape or group of figures has been photographed. The scene may be by Abbey, Chase, or Gifford. Beside the workwoman is the original drawing. A little three-cornered knife in her deft fingers cuts and touches the wood, but in such tiny lines as often can be seen only through the magnifying glass; while she refers frequently to the original drawing to render a form more correctly.

In Charleston, S. C., one young Southern girl has an office for commercial engraving. Until she returned home from studying in the North, there was no such branch of work as hers along the Southern Atlantic seaboard. In some of the Western States women have formed partnerships and gone into the business of engraving.

Many interiors of dwellings and public buildings show that women decorators have worked successfully. The names of Mrs. Wheeler and Miss Revere Johnson are well known. In the Union League Club of New York and the Seventh Regiment Armory the richly-glowing work of some portions was painted by a woman; while the harmoniously-toned stained glass by a sister artist attests her talent and skill. Magnificently-embroidered curtains, where nets filled with glittering fish that have suffered a sea change into something new and strange, evince the elegant taste of a lady foremost as a decorator.

The rooms of the Associated Artists in New York disclose a charming life. Modern tapestry is wrought here by hands that follow closely the methods of Beauvais or Bayeux; while masses of roses or trailing vines in their luxuriant beauty and the varying forms of nature are copied in floss on satin. Textile fabrics of many sorts appear wrought by fingers that weave a glitter into satin or give a bloom to homely fabrics. This little world has its own intense life, while it is scarcely known outside except by such stately pieces of embroidery as the great curtain of the stage at the Madison Square Theatre. In other directions of beautiful embellishment the art-paper manufacturers have produced some of their best hangings from designs furnished them by women. The silk factories of the Messrs. Cheney owe to our art students patterns for brocades and satins, besides suggestions

for weaving their splendid goods which add to the sheen of satin the diaphanous effect of velvet, or which by various threads and surfaces increase their richness and beauty.

Among new directions of art, pen and ink illustration furnishes a promising field. Newspapers and magazines are filled with many a sketch from the busy brain of a woman, printed from her drawing without the intervention of the engraver's block.

Mediæval illuminators, stonecutters or metal workers, dreamed and wrought with almost religious enthusiasm, and we fancy the sweet serenity in which these toilers for beauty spent their happy days. On us are shed, from time to time, the side-lights of many little groups of persons who in our own day still perpetuate such a remote and ideal experience. Girls and women are heard of who, content to be poor and unknown, are happy and serene in carrying out plans for stained glass or mural ornamentation in the studios of Mr. Lafarge, Mr. Tiffany, Mr. Crowninshield, and other artists who can guide the brain of those who yet furnish many a delicate thought in clever arrangement of form or color.

Among rich American women are found such ladies as Mrs. Maria Longworth Nicholas, now Mrs. Bellamy Storer, who founded the Rookwood potteries at Cincinnati, and herself supported a pottery school. Cincinnati pottery is widely known, and in it the influence of women is clearly discernible. Miss Louise McLaughlin has the credit of re-discovering the Haviland underglaze. She modified this Haviland process with Japanese methods till an attempt was finally made for a distinctive style; and her potteries are now famous for their unusual variety of glazes and clay surfaces.

Cincinnati women have made their mark also as wood carvers. Many a piece of magnificent representation of animal and vegetable forms, as rich as Flemish or Italian carvings, attests the skill and taste of these artists. Women are taking an important part in the art education of children. Such institutions as the Cooper Institute, the Art Students' League and the Boston Normal Art School, furnish multitudes of teachers. Many of these are Supervisors of State drawing schools in our large cities and towns, where often 10,000 children are under the influence of one of these ladies. A young woman has studied with New York artists, themselves pupils of Carolus Duran, Gérôme, or Henner; has graduated at the Art Students' League, or the Cooper Institute, or perhaps has drawn and painted in Paris or Munich; at twenty-five, she goes to Wisconsin, Michigan, or still further West. Here she has a dozen teachers of the public schools to instruct directly, and she supervises drawing-classes over large sections of those States. Far away on the frontier such a teacher gets up painting-classes in her own studio, where she hangs up studies made under Mr. Gifford or Mr. Weir. She starts an Art Club for the circulation of photographs from the great masters, on the same principle as a Book Club. Then small art libraries are formed.

We have not dwelt at all in this article on the oil and water color pictures made by women and seen in our exhibitions. Such work is public, and everyone has a chance to know of many a good portrait or bit of still life. But we have endeavored to throw light into some of the by-ways of Art which are subtly and surely affecting the life of this nation, though to what extent is generally little known.

SUSAN N. CARTER.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXI.

OCTOBER, 1892.

A VINDICATION OF HOME RULE.

A REPLY TO THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND.

In The North American Review for August, the Duke of Argyll has contributed an article in which he proposes to show that there is a close analogy or an absolute identity in principle between the gigantic effort of the American people in 1861-5, first to limit the area of negro slavery and then to abolish it altogether, and the present struggle in which he is engaged to rivet upon the people of Ireland a form of government to which they have never constitutionally assented, which they were only compelled to obey by an armed force, in their small island, of more than one hundred and thirty thousand men,* which the Duke himself knows that they dislike or abhor, and which they declare to be totally unsuitable for the supply of their practical wants in legislation. They support these allegations by returning five-sixths or four-fifths of their Parliamentary representatives to uphold them. We acknowledge their competency as citizens by allowing to them the widest household suffrage, with the protection of a most carefully constructed system of secret voting.

Even those who forced on Ireland the Act of Union loudly declared it was to give them an absolute equality of rights and laws with their fellow citizens in the other kingdoms; whereas every Englishman and every Scotchman knows that the conditions of Irish government, as above briefly and slightly set forth, would neither be attempted by any legislature nor tolerated by either of the peoples of Great Britain.

* "Grattan's Life and Times," V., 31.

Copyright, 1892, by Lloyd Bryce. All rights reserved.

The task the Duke took in hand was to convert the American people to the opinion that to liberate a race is the same thing as, if not to enslave them, yet to deny them all the rights of communities, historically national and independent, over their own destinies. The execution of this task, not easy in itself, was grievously hampered by the indisputable fact that the sentiments passed by the Duke across the water were in the act of being constitutionally repudiated by his own countrymen, who, before his article could appear, were to choose a Parliament with a majority in direct opposition to his views.

A gentleman, belonging to the Republican party, and in the first rank of public distinction in America, told me before the last Presidential election that thirteen million votes would be cast at it, and that, of those thirteen millions, twelve and a half would be favorable to the cause of Ireland. Will the arguments of the Duke serve to diminish this enormous phalanx of opinion by the subtraction of a single man ?

But the word arguments is a misnomer. Those who wish for arguments on this question must look elsewhere. It is best to separate altogether this paper from the personality of its eloquent and distinguished author, and, regarding it in the abstract as we regard a proposition of Euclid, to take our measure of it simply as an example of the highest heights and the longest lengths to which assertion can be pushed apart from citation, from reference, from authority, from that examination either of the facts or the literature of the case, to which the writer does not condescend. Of this he becomes sensibly aware towards the close of his paper and he informs his readers accordingly that he has written it *currente calamo*. A truly singular announcement. The *currens calamus* is an instrument well adapted for the journalist who in the small hours of the night has to render for the morning papers, in a few minutes, the pith or the froth, as the case may be, of the debate scarcely ended, or the telegram just arrived ; but surely less appropriate for a statesman who dates his birth as a Cabinet Minister from forty years back, and who has now been spending many of those years in leisure, and it is a most equivocal compliment to the American nation, which has taken its stand on the side of Ireland through its legislatures, its governors, its very highest organs, as well as its countless masses, to suppose that it will execute its *volte-face* at a moment's

warning in obedience to a *currens calamus*. And it is a *currens calamus* indeed; for the article affords no indication that its author has ever reined in the gallop of his pen for a moment to study any book or even any speech or pamphlet about Ireland. There is one wonderful exception: the Duke has been reading, and has cited, Montalembert's "Monks of the West," from which he learns that Ireland had its golden age "some 1,300 years ago";* that even then the Celtic Church had "incurable vices of constitution," and that there was no law in the country except the English law "in the smaller area of the Pale,"—which Pale and which English law had no existence in Ireland until more than six centuries afterwards. Such is the working of the *currens calamus* when the article accidentally stumbles into the domain of fact.

And the argument of the passage is no better than its history. The argument is that because 1,300 years ago the Celtic Church was divided, and fomented other divisions, therefore the Irish of to-day are incompetent to manage their own Irish affairs. But if the discord of 1,300 years back was so bad, what are we to say of that extraordinary union in the very same body which has now been maintained for so many centuries, that union which has been proof alike against the sword and the penal laws, and, as in the Balkan Peninsula, has given in the eyes of the people a special consecration to the church, as the nursing mother, not only of their religious life, but of all their civil hopes and aspirations?

It is time, however, to make frankly one admission. It is that the Duke's conclusion is fully warranted by his premises. If they stand, it stands. But what are these premises? Let us recite some of his assumptions. The Irish leaders all profess their desire to remain in unity with Great Britain; but they all do it falsely. † The people make the same profession; but they also are liars, except a few who are dupes.‡ A parliament, elected by "the individual subjects or citizens" of Ireland, would make "legislative attacks" upon the "life, liberty and property" of those very persons who had elected it. § The principles of the leaders are fatal to all "industrial progress" and "the secure enjoyment of any property,"‖ with respect to which they are "pure anarchists." ¶ In many parts the priests will reign supreme over "ignorant, superstitious and dependent peasants,"** and "anarchical fanatics." These are some of the leading prem-

* p. 134. † p. 129. ‡ ibid. § p. 131. ‖ ibid. ¶ p. 132. ** ibid.

ises of the article. They prove the conclusion, and more than the conclusion. They show, if they can be sustained, that the Irish people are savages; perhaps, rather, that they are a sort of compound between brute and demon; that there are not the common avenues to their minds, which we find in the case of mankind at large. It is as if in physics, sweet and sour, hot and cold, moist and dry, were confounded together. The common rudiments of human existence and actions are in their case inverted, perverted, and confounded. Other men enter into political society for the sake of securing life and property, and of promoting industry and the arts of life, but the Irish for the purpose of restraining or overturning them. We cannot frame a rational government for them, more than for Yahoos or Houyhnhnms. Either in the character of liars, or of knaves, or of dupes, they are outside the pale of ordinary human dealing. Might not the scuttling of the island, ironically proposed by Swift, be the best and simplest mode of handling the Irish question? Assertions and consequences of assertions, such as these, supply by their extravagance their own best confutation. But it may be well to bear in mind a few indisputable facts. We have had and we have a great body of Irish Nationalists in Parliament. Their ability is not denied. The testing efficacy of our Parliamentary proceedings is well known. Other men, and other parties, have charged on one another, in the late Parliament, breach of faith,* which is falsehood. No such charge has been proved, nay, none such has ever been advanced against these men, whom the article so grossly reviles. To the charges of heated and dangerous language they may in other days, and in some cases, have been open; but, since a prospect of reconciliation with Great Britain has been opened, no more has been heard even of this serious, but, under the circumstances, probably inevitable evil. Moreover, the Irish nation had, between 1782 and 1795, the management of its own affairs. What was the effect on life and property, on industry and progress? It was confessed in the debates on the Union by both sides alike, and notably by Lord Clare, that the period of independence had been a period of unexampled material progress. "Yes," it will be said, "but this was under a Protestant Parliament"; and truly said. But it is also

* It is needless, and would be offensive, to cite names. The fact will not be questioned.

true that this Protestant Parliament admitted Roman Catholics to the franchise in 1793, and was ready to admit them to full equality in Parliament in 1795, when the deplorable recall of Lord Fitzwilliam arrested the National movement and gave hope and life to faction. Nor is it less true that the Protestants of the North then declared, with much more appearance of unanimity than has recently been seen in the opposite sense, that the recent changes had both removed all ground of differences with England and had "united the once distracted Irish people into one indissoluble mass." This was the declaration of forty-five corps of volunteers published at the time; * and the Duke of Argyll cannot escape from the force of such original and weighty testimony by describing it as "inflated fable."

The article warns America against my statements on Irish history as being untrustworthy. This is a quiet way of disposing of a series of utterances which fill a moderate volume, which are historical in form, which supply references to test their correctness, and which have recently been republished,† so as to give the utmost facility for confutation. With these facilities before him, the Duke does not refute, nor attempt to refute, even one of these statements. But, instead of a refutation, he says, "for example,"‡ that I have represented the bill of 1886 as only giving back to Ireland a limited share of what she had once enjoyed, whereas she "never has had a Parliament with one-tenth of the enormous power given by that scheme."§ All property and all liberty was left absolutely at the mercy of the Irish Parliament. "So monstrous a proposition had never been made before by any statesman."‖ And this (supposed) misdescription of my own bill is given by the writer as proving my "misrepresentations of Irish history," which it is plain he has never examined, any more than he has examined Irish history itself.

My description, however, of the bill was perfectly accurate. The Parliament of 1782 was in itself sovereign and independent, in the very same sense as the Parliament of Great Britain. The Parliament contemplated in 1886 was at once accepted, on behalf of Irish Nationalism, by Mr. Parnell, as "a subordinate Parliament." But, according to the Duke, the sovereign Parliament had not one-tenth part of the power of the subordinate Parlia-

* Declaration, pp. 2, 11, 1783. † "Special Aspects of the Irish Question." London: Murray. 1892. ‡ p. 132. § p. 133. ‖ p. 131.

ment. Let us look a little closer into the matter. The Parliament of 1782 had power to act upon peace and war, upon army, navy, and defence in general, upon commerce, and every description of taxation, and this power was all of it exclusive power. But the bill of 1886 kept in imperial hands, *inter alia*, substantially and I believe in strict legal form, the whole of these great jurisdictions. Here is indeed an arithmetical puzzle: Parliament A has every legislative power possessed by Parliament B, and has, in addition, the very highest matters placed within its sphere, and yet, so says the writer of the article, Parliament A has not one-tenth part of the power of Parliament B. Such are the exploits of the *currens calamus*.

It is true, indeed, that neither of the schemes gave to Ireland by law what is called responsible government; while it is also true that such government was not contemplated in 1782, and was contemplated in 1886. And what is this but a bugbear set up by the writer of the article to frighten us out of our seven senses? In 1782, responsible government, that is to say an executive directly dependent on the majority of the popular chamber, did not yet formally exist, even in England. Mr. Pitt, in 1783, did not resign, nor did he at once dissolve, when condemned by the House of Commons, but abode his time, and the majority of the House was undisguisedly on the side of his opponents during the interval. Within my own personal recollection, there was no responsible government in the British Empire, except that at Westminster. But now, wherever a local autonomy has been granted, responsible government waits upon it, and in not one of these instances, perhaps approaching a score in number, has it been found to cause the smallest strain upon the bonds of union between the United Kingdom and the colonies. It is hardly possible to imagine the degree of perverse ingenuity which alone could lead any cabinet, or which has now led at least one statesman, to the conclusion that at this epoch, when responsible government, in conjunction with local autonomy, has (for us) become universal, and has been discovered to be harmless, the negation of it should be kept alive in the single case of Ireland, as if for no other purpose than to inflict dishonor on that country.

The article before me is as full of insults to Ireland as a plum-pudding is full of plums. Americans can hardly conceive how completely ingrained in the mental habits of many, who boast

their support of the union, is the practice of insulting that country. The Duke of Argyll was a gallant adversary to negro slavery. And in too many ways the negro was dishonored and oppressed. But, the negro never, I believe, met with that particular species of oppression which is termed insult, in the same manner as the Irishman. One statesman, a prime minister, classes Irishmen with Hottentots; still we have another, who charitably divides them between knaves and dupes. By the completeness of his excommunication of that race from the human pale, the writer of this article and his *currens calamus* have carried the practice to such a height, that, as at least we may rest sure, in the future it can never be exceeded.

It appears to be thought that Irish Nationalists go a-roaring after power like lions after their prey. But Mr. Parnell himself proposed that the British Parliament should retain in its own hands exclusively for a certain time the power of legislating on the critical question of land; and all the Nationalists, in 1886, with readiness, concurred in a proposal which absolutely debarred the local Parliament of Ireland from constructing a church establishment. For these instances of moderation they never receive a word of credit. The writer of the article supposes that the bill of 1886 gave them exceptional powers of legislation in respect to life and property. It gave them no powers whatever, except such as are possessed in the colonies by every autonomous community. The writer thinks that the rights of the American States are those which the Federal constitution "gives"* to them, and seems unaware that the powers of the Federal constitution are exclusively powers given, or, in the language of the constitution itself, "delegated" † to it by the States, who acquired their respective sovereignties by the Declaration of Independence and the treaty that put an end to the war. He dwells on the fact that no limitation has been placed upon the Irish, analogous to the amendment introduced into the Federal Constitution after the war of secession. If the Duke has read those amendments, which may be doubted, he must be aware that among the fifteen articles of which they consist, there is not one which could gall the withers of the Irish Nationalism, least of all those which relate to slavery. Article XIII. prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude except for crime; and Article XV. provides that per-

* p 152. † Amendments to the Constitution, Art. 10.

sonal rights are not to be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Can even the ultraism of the Duke lead him to the point of believing that they have the smallest relevancy to the case of Ireland, or that inserting them in a bill for Home Rule would be anything more than a frivolous amusement?* "Our colonists," he says, "carry with them all the principles and doctrines of the common law of England."† Yes, they do‡, but subject to alteration; and in like manner Ireland will carry with her both the common and the statute law, not to mention such statute laws as the Act of 1887, which Great Britain, represented at Westminster in 1887, has fastened upon her feebler sister.

The anti-Irish imagination feasts itself upon the horrors which an Irish Parliament is to enact, and on the impotence of the Imperial legislature to prevent them. Let us consider the case presented to us. Thirty-five millions of Britons are to stand by with their arms folded while three millions of Irish Nationalists inflict on two other millions (such is the Unionist calculation) every kind of lawless wickedness—and this, while the thirty-five millions have the entire military force of the land and of the Empire in their hands, and while the two millions who, according to the same authorities, possess the main part of the property, the intelligence, and the industry of the country, patiently allow themselves to be led like lambs to the slaughter. How reason with prophets such as these, any more than with an infuriated crowd of other days who have seized an old woman for a witch and are carrying her to the place of burning?

The case of Ireland is analogous to that of the great self-governing colonies, which in all respects, except those of suffering and wrong, may fairly be compared with her. As to them all alike, these anticipations are preposterous in their absurdity, and cruel in their insolence. But, as it is absurd to suppose that either in the dominion of Canada, or in any other colony, or in Ireland, a reign of terror could be established, and justice trampled under foot, so it is equally absurd to suppose (and most of all in the case of a country separated from us by only a few score miles of sea) that the Imperial power would view such a state of things with indifference, and become a party to it by a shameful acquiescence.

* The Articles are quoted from Sterne s "Constitutional History of the United States, p." 303. †p. 131. ‡ "Anson on the Constitution," II. 257.

The general upshot is that Ireland generously agrees to undergo every restraint which is imposed upon the autonomous colonies, and many other restraints. They retain legislation upon trade, they deal with the question of our own defence, they contribute nothing to our charges. Ireland willingly abandons all these powers and consents to bear her equal share of Imperial burdens; and, under these circumstances, such is the astounding force of prejudice, there are to be found men of rank, character, and ability, who denounce such a guarded gift of autonomy to Ireland as a thing monstrous and unheard of in its extent.

But the writer concludes his article with a series of statements intended to show that all the woes of Ireland are self-sought and self-inflicted. On this subject it is quite unnecessary for me to deal with him in detail. To stand side by side with his opinion, I present to the American reader the following remarkable exposition by Lord Salisbury:

"What is the reason that a people with so bountiful a soil, with such enormous resources, lag so far behind the English in the race? Some say that it is to be found in the character of the Celtic race. But I look to France, and see a Celtic race there, going forward in the path of prosperity with most rapid strides: I believe at the present moment more rapidly than England herself. Some say it is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion. But I look to Belgium, and I find there a people second to none in Europe, except the English, for industry, singularly prosperous, considering the small space of country that they occupy, having improved to the uttermost the natural resources of that country, but distinguished among all the peoples of Europe for the earnestness and intensity of their Roman Catholic belief. Therefore I cannot say that the cause of the Irish distress is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion. An honorable friend near me says that it arises from the Irish people listening to demagogues. I have as much dislike to demagogues as he has: but when I look to the Northern States of America I see there a people who listen to demagogues, but who undoubtedly have not been wanting in material prosperity. It cannot be demagogues, Romanism, or the Celtic race. What, then, is it? I am afraid *that the one thing which has been peculiar to Ireland has been the Government of England.*"*

There is, however, one other authority which I may quote against the Duke of Argyll, and which he may deem worth my quoting. It is the Duke of Argyll. A very few years ago he was more temperately and more equitably minded with respect to Ireland. In the end of 1885, he addressed a letter to the *Times* newspaper which it may be well to bring under the notice of the

* Hansard, Vol. 177, p. 719.

American reader. The Duke argues, after referring to the arrangements with our colonies, that the inexorable conditions of physical geography demand in Ireland a kind and a measure of connection which is impossible farther off.

And where did the Duke find a solution for this difficulty? Not in the provisions established by the Act of Union as it now stands. He looked across the Atlantic, not as now to estrange the American people from the cause of Ireland, but to supply in principle a pattern upon which we might model the work which he then plainly contemplated as needful. His words are:

"The United States alone, of all the nations of the earth, must in this matter be our great exemplar." *

How then stands the case at this moment. The Duke labors to convert the people of the Union to the opinion he now holds, but away from the opinion he held only six years ago. I have cited his arguments and the passage in which he declares that for determining the relations between Ireland and Great Britain, the relation of the States to the Union is to supply our great exemplar. Does that passage give Ireland less than the plan of 1886? or does it not give more?

W. E. GLADSTONE.

Note: I do not wish to burden the text with matters merely personal to myself. But the Duke states—as usual, without quoting words: (1) That I have declared that all Irish grievances have been removed (p. 135); (2) that I never discovered "all this" till I was past 75; and (3) that I denounced Irish leaders for describing Irish history in the manner in which I now describe it. I call for proof of these three assertions, only adding (*a*) that the great efforts of Parliament to deal with the most notorious and crying grievances, such as the Church and the land laws, have afforded the most signal proofs that the sentiment of nationality lies deeper than these; (*b*) that in 1882, when I was Prime Minister, I imposed no limit upon home rule† except the limit which I now seek to impose, namely, that it is in no way to impair the central authority requisite to govern and to bind the empire.

* Duke of Argyll, December 26, 1885, in the *Times* of December, 29, p. 6, col. 1.
† Hansard, Feb. 9, 1882.

THE EXCISE LAW AND THE SALOON.

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, BISHOP OF ALBANY.

A STATEMENT somewhat casually introduced in an article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for July has, I am glad to see, attracted more attention than anything else in the article, as I hoped it would.

The statement was this, "I am inclined to think that the clergy would be wise to begin an effort to wipe out all excise legislation from the statute books, and keep, only in the Penal Code, enactments which would punish drunkenness and the makers of it, the violation of Sunday, and the grosser evils of the liquor trade." This seemed to many people a rash statement and a suggestion of what, to say the least of it, was very questionable both in principle and in application, and I am not prepared to say that it is not rash and questionable; but I desire to make the suggestion a little fuller and clearer for purposes of discussion, because I am abundantly satisfied in my own mind that the political condition of the State of New York has reached a point that demands some heroic remedy. Bad as is the debauching of the people by unlimited and unrestricted liquor, the worst and most dangerous of all debauching of the people is the destruction of the political moral sense; and since it is true that politics have become so important to the liquor interest that it is to the advantage of the liquor men to elect our law-makers, and true that the liquor interest is so important to the politicians that it is necessary for them to submit to the dictation of representatives of that interest in the making of laws, it seems to me that we have arrived at a crisis when we might as well select Scylla as Charybdis on which to be wrecked.

I readily recognize the patent objections to the plan. In the

first place, it is of course true that the liquor dealers want legislation for other than mere excise questions; but their demand for any kind of legislation would be largely lessened if the legislators were not entirely subject to the liquor power. It is true also that the saloons are of value to candidates for office, because the saloon-keeper is supposed to control the votes of the people who frequent his saloon; but it is true also, over against this, that the saloon would cease to be the political centre, the place which controls the primary meetings often held in it, if the saloon ceased to depend for its existence upon legislative favor.

Then comes the great question of principle, whether the State has any right to allow an article which is capable of such infinite ruin and harm to be sold without any restriction at all. The *crux*, I confess, in my mind lies here. It has been considered always necessary to restrict in some degree the sale of dynamite and drugs, of poisons and gunpowder, and we should hardly be prepared to leave these open and free; and there can be no question in the mind of any reasonable human being that more damage comes from the sale of liquor than from the sale of all these others combined; but it is, sometimes at any rate, wise, when no great moral principle is at stake, to consider the question of expediency and policy, and to seek rather to obtain important results than to insist upon a particular method of securing them.

Believing as I do that the use of intoxicating drinks can not by any possibility be prevented; that it is a natural appetite; that it is not in itself sin, but only sinful in abuse; that horrible and hideous as the results of this abuse are, the only remedy lies in "the Gospel of the *grace of God*;" that even if all manufacture and sale of liquor were prohibited, it would be against the divine plan of dealing with our human nature, which must be disciplined by the presence, that it may be strengthened against the power, of temptation; I believe also that it is one of those many questions of political economy, which, if left alone, without artificial influence, would regulate itself by the well-known law of supply and demand.

There certainly are more saloons in our large towns than are needed to satisfy the thirst of the people. The increased number of these saloons is due to their political value, and if that were taken away I think the number of saloons would be at once diminished. If we could ever have secured the

application of the principle of high license, or a regulation of the number of saloons according to the number of the population in a certain district, we would have reached, I believe, the best cure for this great evil; but an experience of twenty years in the capital of this State convinces me that that is impossible. That the Democratic party is more responsible for this condition of things than the Republican, is merely due to the fact that the Democratic party has been longer in power during these years than the Republican; but as parties, both of them, whenever it suited their purposes, have been subservient to this liquor control; so that the practical conclusion seems to me to be what was stated in the article to which I have referred, that "liquor ought to be removed from politics and politics from liquor, by ceasing to legislate on the question at all."

There are other questions connected with the desperate hurt of the abuse of stimulants which, of course, can not be left without some correction and control. The Penal Code of the State of New York, either as it exists or as it can be amended, furnishes, I think, the place where these corrections and this control can be applied.

The Sunday law, for instance, as it has always pertained in the statute books of this State, forbids the opening of shops and stores on Sunday, and would include, of course, among these shops and stores the places in which liquor is sold. It is only necessary to insist upon the closing of all places of business on the Lord's Day (with the present exceptions allowed), and to enforce the present law against their opening, in order to secure this important result. See Penal Code, Chap. I., Title X., Section 267.

Section 266, Chap. I., Title I. of the Penal Code, which forbids trades, manufactures, etc., on the first day of the week, has in it a statement to which I think some consideration ought to be given, even though it be somewhat aside and apart from the subject of this article. It refers to "the repose" and "religious liberty" of the community.

I have so often, in discussion before committees of the legislature, heard the representative of the liquor interests,—generally a portly and well-preserved German, bearing evidence both in his speech and in his look of a cordial appreciation of his national beverage,—insist that all legal observance of the Lord's Day was

a violation of liberty, that it seems worth while, just for a moment, to suggest that, in the first place this is *not* primarily and in its essence a religious question at all, because the observance of one day in the week as a day of rest is primeval, and antedates all revelation of religious law; and because, in the next place, there is no attempt to enforce any religious observance upon those who do not desire it for themselves; but only a protection for those who do desire freedom of religious worship, not to be disturbed and distracted in it by the intrusion into the quietness of an Anglo-Saxon Sunday of either the occupations, the amusements, or the offences of the ordinary days of the week.

The laws in the Penal Code regulating the care and control of minors and of people of weak or unsound mind would cover the crime of the sale of liquor to such as these; and drunkenness, whether boisterous or dangerous to life, ought to be punished by the general law of penalties. If, in addition to these, men who have or sell any adulterated liquor were prosecuted as severely as if they have or sell any adulterated drug (see Penal Code, Title XII., Sec. 407), we should go very far towards reaching what is perhaps the most serious cause of intemperance, namely, the quality far more than the quantity of the stuff that is drunk; and it seems to me that in the laws regulating the holding of elections there might easily be a clause inserted which would forbid the sale of liquor on election days within a fixed vicinity of the polling place.

I am not absolutely certain that if it were in my power to make this change I should feel safe in doing it, because I should want to be surer than I am of the legal sufficiency of my argument; but I am well satisfied that the suggestion is worth consideration and discussion by those who are better able to judge of the applicability of law than I am. There is one advantage at least, that if such a condition of things as this were brought about we should have, working together upon one plane for a better condition of things, the temperance people and the total abstinence people; for it is a well-known fact, that a consistent prohibitionist cannot consent to even an effort to improve the Excise law, because by so doing he recognizes what to him is impossible, the right of the State to recognize liquor-selling as a legitimate occupation.

It ought not to be omitted from the consideration of this sub-

ject that as the law at present stands there is such an interdependence between police administration and political influence that the power of the liquor dealer is felt, not only in the making but in the execution of the Excise law. And it would be well to remove the police from the politicians, and both from the power of the liquor interest.

There are two matters of such grave consequence that some mention of them ought to be made in this discussion. In the first place, it is true that the fees derived from the sale of licenses are appropriated by law to important objects, under the direction of the Supervisor; "applied," as the law says, "to the payment of the ordinary expenditures payable from the general fund of the city or town respectively, unless otherwise provided by a special or local law." The answer, I think, to this is perfectly plain. In the first place it is both the duty and within the power of every community to provide for its ordinary expenditures without resort to this method of securing funds, and, in the next place, the same statement really applies to this point that has been already made in regard to the use of fees from the Louisiana lottery. *If* under the present system the saloon power is increased, no amount of money derived from it, for any purpose, no matter how good, can be the excuse for its maintenance.

The only remaining difficulty *that I can see* is that it may be said that to do away with an excise law would remove what is called the civil damage act; of which I have simply this to say, that both in the act in relation to Excise, which is chapter 403 of the Laws of New York, passed in 1892, and in section 40 of the present Excise law, all value is absolutely taken away from what I nevertheless believe to be an important provision. The only recovery that can be "had in any civil action of the damages suffered by reason of the intoxication of any person," etc., is in case a written notice forbidding such sale has been given to the person selling the intoxicating drink.

It must have been patent even to the framers of the law that this absolutely emptied the act of all value, because in any town or city, especially in the largest cities, it is utterly impossible for notice to be given by anybody to *every* saloon keeper, and equally impossible to confine drunkards to any *single* saloon.

I believe, therefore, that the remedy for this is to add to the Penal Code a statute which shall make the sale of intoxicating

drink to an habitual drunkard or to a drunken man a crime, punishable by the closing of the saloon for a definite period, in case a judgment is recovered by any person who chooses to prosecute the saloon keeper for a penalty, which should be imposed in addition to the closing of the saloon.

If I seem to write without the courage of my own convictions, it is merely that I realize that a layman who is neither lawyer nor legislator may fail to see very real difficulties. But I am convinced, *so far as I can see,* that we should be better off than we are now, with *no* Excise law ; and my only doubt about making the change is, that I would rather wait until wiser men have probed the question more thoroughly.

I ought, I think, to say that my object in asking the insertion of this article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW is simply to bring the matter before the people for discussion ; and that I only write under a very deep sense of the desperate evil of the moral, physical, political, and personal degradation of the existing condition of things.

WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE.

THE REAL ISSUE.

BY SENATOR G. G. VEST, OF MISSOURI.

THE same issue that disrupted the cabinet of Washington in 1793, and caused Jefferson to surrender his portfolio as Secretary of State, aligns the two great parties in the pending canvass.

When Alexander Hamilton declared in his Report on Manufactures that under the clause of the constitution which gave Congress power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare," it was intended to authorize such import duties, without limitation, as Congress deemed necessary for the protection and encouragement of American manufactures, Jefferson respectfully informed the President that it was impossible for him to remain in the cabinet. He denounced the position of Hamilton as establishing Congressional absolutism; and when Washington afterwards attempted to reconcile the two ministers, Jefferson said that "as to a coalition with Mr. Hamilton, if by that was meant that either was to sacrifice his general system to the other, it was impossible."

Through all the mutations of American politics, though often obscured and interrupted by sectional and financial questions, this great controversy has marked the dividing line between the Democratic party and its adversaries. It is not simply a question of constitutional construction or of taxation, but one involving the essential and vital principle upon which free government must rest. If this be a government of limited and defined functions in every department, and in which each citizen has equal rights with every other citizen; if the government is the property of all, the agent and servant of all under a written con-

stitution, then it is monstrous to assert that unlimited discretion should be vested anywhere to take the property of one citizen for the purpose of enriching another.

It is fondly believed that our fathers intended to build a governmental fabric every stone and timber in which should be an eternal protest against the doctrine of absolutism as to rights, both of property and opinion. But how can this be possible if Congress, under the guise of providing for the general welfare, can levy such import taxes as confiscate the proceeds of one citizen's life and labor to promote the interests of others ?

The issue is plain and unmistakable.

Under Hamilton's system Congress can establish a partnership between favored classes and the government, by which the functions and powers of the latter are subordinated to the building up of private fortunes, under the pretence of providing for the general welfare.

Under Jefferson's system no power exists in Congress or any department to make any citizen pay more than his just share of the taxes necessary to carry on the government, and it is a prostitution of the taxing power to build up or protect any industry by increasing for such purpose the taxes levied upon other citizens.

It is a significant and reassuring fact that the tacticians and party managers have been unable to swerve the great body of the Democratic party from this issue, or from the candidate who, as President of the United States, staked his political fortunes upon it.

It is doubtless true that many voters will be influenced by the question of free coinage, but it must be clear to all those who oppose the present tariff that no permanent relief can come from an increase of the circulating medium alone, without tariff reform. Money, no matter how abundant, will go, from the same causes, where the largest portion goes now,—to the protected classes. To claim that an increase in the volume of currency will remedy unequal and unjust taxation, is to argue that adding more water to the floods of the Mississippi will close the crevasse in a levee on its banks.

The existing tariff is an obstruction to healthy and legitimate commerce. It narrows and restricts the markets for American products, and especially those of agriculture. It is based upon the idea that the American farmer must look to the home market

alone, and if that does not give remunerative prices for his surplus, the loss must be borne patiently and patriotically for the general welfare.

Senator Morrill, the father of protection, thus stated it:

"The lesson to be drawn from all this is that the markets we do not find abroad we must make at home, and they can only be made by protection. Whatever products can be made by machinery we may some time find a market for abroad, but cattle and wool, wheat and corn, are not made by machinery, and we must create a greater market for such products by a greater home diversity of industrial employments, and with our abounding mineral resources the task would not appear difficult."

Recognizing the fact that the farmers are becoming restive under a system which sacrificed their interests to build up manufactures, Mr. Blaine in his celebrated letter to Senator Frye sounded a note of warning to his Republican friends, and frankly said: "The charge against the protective policy which has injured it most is, that the benefits go wholly to the manufacturers and capitalists and not at all to the farmer."

As England alone furnishes the great market for our agricultural surplus, the exports of cattle, wheat, corn and wheat flour for the year 1891 from the United States to Great Britain being in value $119,223,170, the avenue to relief for the farmer would seem to be in that direction.

The dominating interest, however, in the protection party being that of manufactures, it was, of course, inadmissible to conciliate a manufacturing rival, and Mr. Blaine therefore attempted to cajole the American farmer by reciprocal arrangements with the agricultural and pastoral countries of South America. His original scheme included Canada, as "of the American hemisphere," but the storm of indignation from New England against apprehended Canadian competition forced the late Secretary of State to abandon Canada and confine his negotiations to "the countries south of us." Reciprocity now seeks newer and more enlarged markets for our farming exports in South America and the West Indies, which took from us in 1891 cattle, wheat, corn and wheat flour, amounting to $8,068,468. In other words, political conditions and exigencies force the Republican party, as friends of the farmer, into the absurdity of making commercial war upon the country which purchases almost our entire surplus of agricultural products, while at the same time it pretends to create a market for the American farmer in the countries

of South America, whose people are our rival agriculturists. The tariff protection to the manufacturer is increased, but the farmer must be contented with the promise that the farmers of South America will cease to grow wheat and cattle in order to become consumers of beef and flour from the United States.

The reciprocal arrangement with Brazil, the largest of the South American markets, has been in operation since April 1, 1891, but the President, in a message recently transmitted to the Senate, apologizes for the meagre results in these significant words: "It is proper to suggest that the practical effect of these arrangements can not be measured by the commerce of a month or a year, for the result must depend not alone upon the character of the concessions secured by diplomatic negotiations, but by the degree to which they are utilized by private commercial enterprise." This amounts simply to the admission that unless self-interest, the basis of all commerce, shall increase trade, treaties and reciprocal arrangements are of themselves ineffectual.

The inquiry is still pertinent why the decrease of import duties in favor of our citizens secured by the arrangement with Brazil has diminished instead of increasing the export of farming products from the United States to that country. The message of the President shows that in the twelve months ending March 31, 1892, there was a decrease of $1,212,827 in the exports of breadstuffs and provisions, comprising meat and dairy products, from the United States to Brazil, as compared with the preceding twelve months. During the same period the exports of all articles from this country to Brazil increased $1,052,573, but $1,011,508 of this increase came from the exportation of steam engines, which are now, and have been for years, upon the Brazilian free list. Mr. Blaine, late Secretary of State, in a communication to the President dated February 7, 1891, in which he names the articles placed on the Brazilian free list by the reciprocal arrangement, gives the rate of duty upon all stationary and portable engines under the tariff of Brazil as 15 to 48 per cent., but on page 104 of "Bulletin Number 8," issued by the Bureau of the American Republics, containing the import duties of Brazil, it will be seen that these articles are not subject to duty.

Under reciprocity there has been no appreciable increase of trade between the United States and Brazil except as to engines,

which are duty free in Brazil, no matter by whom imported, and there has been a marked decrease of agricultural exports from this country. These facts demonstrate the utter impotence of diplomatic arrangements to overcome natural conditions and to change the inevitable laws arising therefrom of supply and demand.

It is attempted in the President's message to show an increased trade with Brazil by stating the large business during the last year of the Brazilian Steamship Company, which runs its vessels between New York and Rio de Janeiro. The allusion is most unfortunate for the party of protection and ship subsidies in view of testimony lately given by Mr. Ivins, the President of that company, before the Senate Commerce Committee, who stated that "by valuing our properties at every cent they are possibly worth, we still on the first day of last August had a deficit of about $900,000." The same witness testified that being prohibited by law from purchasing vessels abroad, and by reason of the increased expense in running their vessels his company having come to the verge of bankruptcy, he had laid up two of five American-built vessels and chartered ten foreign ships with which to do business hereafter. It would appear from this testimony that reciprocity with Brazil has not helped our people on either land or ocean.

The most important fact elicited from the reciprocity discussion is the concession by its advocates that the American manufacturer can successfully compete with the English manufacturer in the South American markets with a protective duty in his favor of from four to twelve and a half per cent., while at the same time in this country the McKinley act gives the same American manufacturer protective duties ranging from twenty-five to one hundred per cent., to enable him to take the market on the same goods from his English competitor.

The greatest advantage given under the reciprocal arrangement with Brazil to the American importer on manufactures of iron, cotton, leather, and rubber, amounts to a discrimination of twelve and one-half per cent. in his favor, yet the McKinley act gives protective duties on the same articles in the United States, amounting in some instances to one hundred per cent.

If reciprocity has successfully operated in Brazil and elsewhere with discriminating duties in favor of the American

importer of from only four to twelve and one-half per cent. the same importer paying heavy freight from New York to Rio, a distance of 6,700 miles, is not the imposition of duties ranging from twenty-five to one hundred per cent. under the McKinley act a fraud and outrage? In other words, if our manufacturers can only compete at home with a protective duty of from twenty-five to one hundred per cent., how can they pay transportation charges on the same goods for nearly 7,000 miles, and, with a discriminating duty of from four to twelve and one-half per cent. in their favor, take the market from foreign competitors?

Step by step the opponents of the McKinley law are driving its defenders to their last entrenchments. The contest involves the first and ultimate principle of popular government, the administration of just laws for the equal protection of all citizens.

To doubt the final success of those who now assail the citadel of class legislation, governmental partnership, and monopolistic trusts, is to disparage the justice of God and the capacity of our people for self-government.

G. G. VEST.

THE BUFFALO STRIKE.

BY THEODORE VOORHEES, GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE NEW YORK CENTRAL & HUDSON RIVER RAILROAD.

THE business of a railroad company requires the prompt movement of passengers, mails and freight. To accomplish this a highly complex organization is necessary. Each employee may have but an humble duty to perform, yet the absence of any one of them or any class of employees may block the wheels of the entire machine and disarrange or incommode the traffic. Consequently, the sudden stoppage of work on the part of any number of employees in a single department, although unimportant in itself, may produce serious results to the railroad.

To insure the prompt movement of freight, the work of making up and dispatching trains is divided into two parts—one body of men being engaged in making up the trains at terminal points, another in moving the trains from the terminals to destination. Under the generic term "switchmen" are included all those employees engaged in the operation of shifting and making up trains ready to be dispatched upon the road. This class includes yardmasters, with their assistants, yard conductors and brakemen, and also in some cases the men handling the switches, known as switchtenders.

In the summer of 1888, an agreement was entered into between the companies of the several railroads terminating at Buffalo and their employees in the switching service in that city, establishing their rate of pay. This was an advance upon the rates which had been previously paid in the State of New York, and was a compromise between those rates and the prices paid in Chicago, which were the highest paid in any part of the country.

From the nature of the service, the work in a freight yard of

any magnitude is almost continuous. It cannot be stopped by night or by day, on Sundays or holidays, or at any time. One set of men must relieve the preceding set and keep the motive power in constant use. Perishable freight, such as live stock and other important freight, is being constantly received from connections, and must be handled without any delay whatever, and sent forward.

So well understood is this by all engaged in the work that at the time of the agreement made in 1888 no question was made in regard to the hours of employment. The shifts, so-called, were then, and have been ever since, recognized as of twelve hours each, and the service is constant for every day in the year. In making the agreement a time was recognized as essential for midday or midnight rest and meals, so that the actual hours of labor required on each shift were eleven. The midday or midnight hour was used for providing the engines with coal and water, the practical result being a net use of each locomotive in yard service for about twenty-one hours out of each twenty-four.

These hours being fixed, the schedule of wages agreed upon for the Buffalo men was as follows: Yard conductors, by day, $65; by night, $70. Yard brakemen, by day, $60; by night, $65, with the proviso that these wages were for the week days in each month, and that an additional allowance at the same rates should be paid for Sunday work.

This agreement in regard to extra pay for Sundays was peculiar to Buffalo and cities west thereof; at all other points in the State of New York the rule being to establish the monthly rate of wages at a sum which included all Sunday work.

During the strike of the Knights of Labor against the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company in August, 1890, the yard employees, or switchmen, at Buffalo on that road struck. They had made no grievance known to the company, nor did they make any demand at the time in reference to pay. Their strike was unauthorized by the then leader of the Switchmen's Union, Mr. Sweeny, and as a result their places were filled by non-union men without difficulty.

Prior to this a strike had occurred in the city of Cleveland, O., in the settlement of which the Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railroad Company, and the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, known as the Nickel Plate, agreed to

an advance to their switchmen to an amount practically midway between the prices paid in Buffalo and those paid in Chicago; that is to say, they did not change the rate of pay named above, but agreed that working days should be recognized as of *ten* hours and that additional compensation should be allowed for the eleventh hour, which was equivalent to about a ten per cent. increase. The example of these railroads was followed by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company at Buffalo, which soon paid the same rates.

During the last session of the legislature a bill known as "The Ten-Hour law" was passed, and signed by the Governor on the 20th of May. By its provisions, ten hours' labor performed within twelve consecutive hours constitute a day's labor in the operation of all steam railroads, and additional compensation shall be paid to any employee who shall be employed or permitted to work in excess of ten hours.

Immediately on the signing of this law, the railroad companies throughout the State very generally notified all employees in yard service that their rate of pay thereafter would be a price per hour instead of the monthly rate previously paid; the rate per hour being fixed by dividing the monthly rate by the number of hours that had been required in the past. This arrangement was acquiesced in by the great body of employees without question or dissent. The switchmen at Buffalo, however, made it the occasion of what was practically a demand for an increase in pay. The employees of all the roads, excepting the Lake Shore & Michigan Southern, the Nickel Plate, and the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western railroads, about the 11th of June presented petitions to their respective superintendents, demanding that the rate of pay per hour should be advanced, the amount they demanded being arrived at by dividing the monthly compensation paid prior to to the 20th day of May by ten, so that they would in effect receive an increase of ten per cent. in the net result.

These demands were declined by all the railroad companies, and but little more was heard of the matter until the initiation of the strike which began on Friday night, August 12, at midnight, when the men of the Buffalo Creek, Lehigh Valley, and New York, Lake Erie & Western railroads went out. A strong effort was made immediately to befog the public mind in reference to the hours of labor—the men claiming they were overworked

and only wanted a ten-hour day. Grand Master Sweeny dilated at length in regard to this, and claimed that "the men are simply asking for what is right," etc.; but it was perfectly understood by all the railroad employees that there was no real question of the hours of labor that would have to be performed in any case, but that the strike was simply an effort on their part to bring about an increase in pay.

Undoubtedly it had been the expectation on the part of the labor leaders, generally, that the passage of the law by the legislature, referred to above, would bring about this result of itself, and the new arrangement of paying them by the hour proved a disappointment. On Saturday night, twenty-four hours after the initiation of the strike, a number of incendiary fires were started in the freight yards of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company. Eighteen freight cars, loaded with cotton, wool, merchandise, etc., two passenger coaches and two watchmen's houses were burned; and about the same time, a train of ten coal cars was cut loose and ran into a coal trestle, doing considerable damage. Two passenger trains also were thrown from the track, and a train of loaded freight cars on the New York, Lake Erie & Western Railroad was set on fire and destroyed. All through the day on Sunday serious outbreaks occurred between the strikers and the men who were in the employ of the companies endeavoring to move the trains. A passenger train was thrown from the track on the Erie road in the heart of the city. Other incendiary fires were started during the evening.

On Sunday, August 14, the Sheriff of Erie County issued a notice calling for deputies, and up to eleven o'clock the following day he had secured *forty-five* men. These deputy sheriffs were furnished with blue badges and white batons, and were taken out by the sheriff to the scene of disorder on the line of the Erie road. They were met by a handful of strikers, who counselled them in loud voices to be "white men." Terrified, apparently, by the actual presence of strikers, they at once tendered the sheriff their clubs, and, in large numbers, deserted. A small handful remained and gathered in the shade of a freight car to discuss the situation, which remained quiet because no one dared oppose the strikers. The deputies got back to the city with all expedition. The deserters explained afterwards that the strikers came up and mixed in with them and took their clubs away!

The sheriff thereupon said he would go into the town and make a requisition for the militia, "because it was time to do something besides getting a lot of friends of strikers to act as officers." On Monday, August 15, at the request of the sheriff, the Sixty-fifth and Forty-seventh regiments were ordered on duty.

On August 17, the men in the employ of the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company were all called out by the Switchmen's Union, and following that the men of the West Shore road also struck.

It was soon discovered that the force of militia at the disposal of the local authorities was inadequate to thoroughly protect and guard all points liable to obstruction on the part of the strikers. The amount of railroad property in Buffalo is very large. Of the 24,000 acres embraced in the city limits, 6,400 are railroad property. The total assessed valuation of the city amounts to $170,583,385; of this the railroads bear an assessment of $19,000,000. In four of the city wards the assessed valuation of railroad property amounts to $9,123,995. The extent of railroad tracks within the city limits, and immediately adjacent in the town of Cheektowaga, is between six and seven hundred miles. On the New York Central & Hudson River and West Shore railroads alone, there are nine miles in length of freight yards, each yard filled with sidings and valuable property.

While the total number of strikers at any one time was but small, not exceeding probably 600 men all told, it required a large force to thoroughly patrol and guard all the different points that were open to attack. The railroad tracks and yards are crossed by numerous public streets and highways, so that it became evident that a very large patrol was necessary before any extensive movement of freight could be attempted, even by a single company. The efforts to move freight that were made during the few days immediately succeeding the opening of the strike were attended with the greatest difficulty—trains being cut in two, employees being stoned, switches thrown, switchtenders driven away at night, etc., etc. The people of Buffalo were thoroughly aroused to the importance of the matter and as to the possible claims that might be brought against the city and county for damages resulting from rioting and lawlessness. The strike on Thursday had spread to all the roads in Buffalo; the switchmen on those roads that were already paying the prices demanded by the Switchmen's

Union going on strike out of "sympathy," so-called, for their fellows.

It was with the greatest reluctance that the sheriff finally gave his consent to appeal to the State government for help; but early in the morning of August 18 a dispatch was sent to the Governor, signed by the sheriff and the Mayor of the city, asking for additional assistance from the National Guard of the State. The Governor acted with great decision and promptness, and before 3 A. M. a message was received stating that all the papers had been signed and a large force ordered out. This included in all about 5,000 additional troops. That evening a number of companies arrived from Albany, Troy, Schenectady and Amsterdam; and the Twelfth and Twenty-second regiments from New York, and the Thirteenth from Brooklyn, left their homes for Buffalo. Other companies and regiments started during the night, so that by Friday evening, the 19th, the entire force ordered out was in Buffalo, and stationed at various points in the different railroad yards.

Meanwhile, the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration, on the 18th, according to the law under which they hold office, made a formal effort to arbitrate the question at issue between the switchmen and the railroad companies. They held a public meeting, at which the switchmen were represented by Mr. Sweeny, and the switchmen's side of the question was fully brought out. The railroad companies declined to submit their case in any way to the State Board of Arbitration, the reasons given being, first, that those who had left the employ of the companies by reason of the strike were no longer employees, as their places had been filled; and, second, that there was no obstruction of any kind to the freight service of the railroad companies, excepting by lawless interference and the apprehension thereof, owing to the fact that the properly constituted authorities of the city and county had been unable to furnish protection to those who were in the different companies' service, or those who sought to continue in the performance of their duty. Therefore, there was no grievance or difference between the companies and their then employees. One of the members of the State Board thereupon said that nothing had been accomplished by the Board and that it was impossible to expect that anything would be.

With the advent of the large force of militia, it was evident to all that the strike, so called, was at an end. There was but one

possible way in which it could be extended or the situation made more difficult. If the Switchmen's Union could succeed in getting employees in other departments of the railroad service to strike, out of sympathy, serious inconvenience could be brought to the railroad companies. Consequently, Mr. Sweeny, about the 20th, urged the different organizations of firemen, trainmen and conductors to join in the strike. Mr. Sargent, Grand Master of the Firemen's Association, came to Buffalo on Monday, the 22d, and was joined on Wednesday, the 24th, by Mr. Clark of the Conductors' Association, and Mr. Wilkinson of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. Every effort possible was made to induce Mr. Arthur, the Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, to come to Buffalo, but he declined. These leaders held a a conference with Mr. Sweeny, on Wednesday evening, the 24th, when he appealed to them for help and begged that their men might be called out on a sympathetic strike, but they agreed that it was impossible under the circumstances. Mr. Wilkinson, of the Trainmen, afterwards said that there could be no such thing as a sympathetic strike under their organization. Grand Masters Clark and Sargent left that night for their homes, and shortly before midnight Mr. Sweeny declared the strike off. The effort to get the other organizations to join was the last that could be made, and, that having failed, there was nothing left to do but declare the strike off, as otherwise there would not have been the slightest chance for the strikers to regain the positions they had abandoned.

There has been a good deal said in the public press of late in reference to the rights of labor; that man is a free agent; that he must be left at liberty to work or not to work as he pleases, and that if he is dissatisfied with his position or his employment, it is his duty to stand aside and allow his place to be filled by some one else, if it can be done. It is evident, however, from a review of the Buffalo strike that the sole and only dependence of the switchmen was in violence and intimidation. Their numbers were small; the service that they perform, while hazardous, yet is hardly to be called skilled labor, and it was evident that their places could all be filled within 48 hours. The only possibility they had of success in their strike was, in intimidating others, by actual violence, from taking their places, and in bringing about such loss and damage and disturbance in the operations of the

railroads, that the managers thereof would prefer to acquiesce in the demands for increased pay, rather than submit to the loss and confusion resulting from the strike.

Had they done as their leaders claimed they did, and as a small portion of the press favorable to their cause counselled,—staid away from the yards and refrained from all acts of lawlessness and violence, there would not have been a necessity for the presence of a single soldier, and the operation of all the roads affected would have gone on without delay and inconvenience, other than the necessary breaking in of the new men. It was on violence and incendiarism that they depended, and it was that which turned against them public opinion and brought to the side of the railroad companies the whole power of the State machinery.

The plea for arbitration which was advocated by a portion of the press, and which is always heard at such a time, was equally chimerical. Arbitration with irresponsible bodies of men, men bound by no law to continue in their employment and with whom no contract would be of any value, will never be successful. In the case of those trades unions whose members are skilled, who have a large body of intelligent and picked men, such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, strikes are very rare, and arbitration can be safely resorted to, because their body is such that any agreement or contract entered into on behalf of the men by their own leaders can be depended upon to be carried out by the rank and file. Such organizations command respect, and difficulties with them are rare, and when they do occur are readily adjusted.

The occupation of a switchman is one requiring a certain manual dexterity and quickness. That can, however, be readily acquired. It hardly ranks with skilled labor. It is, perhaps, the most hazardous branch of railroad service, and on that account it has been well paid.

Efforts have been made by railroad companies and by legislatures for some years past, looking to an abatement of the dangers of this occupation. The old form of coupling between two freight cars by means of a link and two pins requires that the switchman shall go between the cars and guide the link into place by hand. This operation, performed by night or in bad weather, and with the one thousand and one varieties of height

and dimension of the cars, results in frequent injury to the man. To obviate this, automatic couplers, that will permit the two cars to be joined together without the presence of the man in between, have been invented, and are very largely in use on railroads in this country. Strange as it may seem, the Switchmen's Union has steadily opposed the introduction of the most improved form of automatic coupler. The only explanation of this that is possible is that the organization, as such, has feared that if once the automatic couplers get into general use the dangers of the switchman's occupation would be so greatly reduced that any one could readily fill the place of a switchman, and that, as a consequence, the organization would cease to have any attraction for the great majority of employees, and would fall to pieces. The fact undoubtedly is that if the link and pin could be at once eliminated from the freight service, the operation of switching cars in a freight yard could be performed with the same safety and ease as is now experienced in making up and switching passenger cars in passenger yards. Accidents happening in this latter occupation are exceedingly rare, and any man of average intelligence, with but a few days' instruction, is competent to fill the position of passenger brakeman. When once the same can be said of freight service there will be an end to any such organization as the existing Switchmen's Union, of which Mr. Sweeny has been the Grand Master.

The lesson of the Buffalo strike further shows the hopelessness of any strike that, first, does not have the sympathy, support and countenance of the press ; and, second, of any strike that depends in any measure whatever for success on possible violence or intimidation.

On the other hand, where a strike is the ultimate effort on the part of employees to obtain justice for fair demands from a corporation, and where their efforts are countenanced by the power of public opinion, such a one will almost inevitably prove successful. A few of the labor organizations that have to do with railroad service recognize this and do not permit or countenance any strike until every effort has been made to bring about an amicable settlement of the question at issue. Others, such as the Switchmen's Union, are organizations whose chief cause of being is to band together employees in a specific branch of the service, with a view to increasing their pay by pressure brought

to bear upon the corporation they serve. So far but little has been attempted in this country on the part of the corporations to counteract this tendency on the part of the men.

There is a fascination in railroad service which irresistibly attracts a large number of young men. Once in its power but few leave the service. A man who has followed a railroad career for a number of years is practically unfitted for any other life.

Applications for service are constant and far beyond the number of vacancies to be filled. The result is that, excepting a small portion of the men employed whose services require the greatest skill, the pay of the average railroad employee is small. How natural it is then for them to want to band together and endeavor by combination and consolidation of interests to increase their pay, and render their positions more secure. In regard to the latter, it may be said that a man employed on the permanent staff of any of the great railroads is secure of his position during good behavior, perhaps more so than an employee in any other branch of industry.

The one great evil that affects the railroad service of this country to-day is that there is no provision made for superannuated or injured employees, and but little in the way of insurance for their families in case of death. The various organizations tempt the men by offering an insurance at death, or in the event of total disability, this insurance being dependent on the contributions of fellow members in each case, and not having back of it any capital sum or amount that offers permanent security. When employees are questioned as to the causes which lead them to join various organizations, their answer almost invariably is, "In order to secure some form of insurance." But this makes no provision for old age or superannuation. One or two attempts have been made to provide a fund for the insurance and the care of aged and disabled employees in this country, with more or less success.

The writer believes that some form of insurance or superannuation fund ought to be provided as part of the regular organization of all corporations. Most of the railways in Great Britain have superannuation, insurance, provident, and pension societies, which have been established by the companies, and which the employees are required to join in accordance with the regulations of the road.

A few companies in this country have organized a voluntary relief association, by which any man in the employ of the company, by the payment of a small sum monthly, becomes entitled to a death benefit, or to a sick benefit in case of sickness or injury; and have also made an arrangement by which the company acts as a savings bank for the employee who desires to deposit any amounts, on which three per cent. interest is allowed by the corporation. This should be extended, in the writer's belief, so as to include some provision for superannuated employees. One of the most difficult questions to be settled is what to do with the old employees who have rendered faithful service and who have become practically unable by age and infirmity to fulfill their duties, and yet for whom no provision can be found in the ordinary operation of the road. If a man entering railroad service in his youth, by paying a small sum monthly, could look forward either to a positive insurance for the benefit of his family in case of death or total disability; or, second, to a weekly stipend in the case of sickness or injury that would incapacitate him for a time; and also, to a system of pension to which he could look forward after years of faithful service; and could feel that back of this he had, not a hazardous dependence on the voluntary contributions of his fellow employees, but the capital account of the railroad corporation which he served, his interest would be largely bound up with the company, and he would hesitate before entering upon any ill-matured scheme of a strike or demand that was not based upon such absolute right and justice as would insure success when all facts were properly ventilated and brought to the bar of public opinion.

THEODORE VOORHEES.

SOME ADVENTURES OF A NECROMANCER.

BY CHEVALIER HERRMANN.

It is certain that every prestidigitator since the world first knew of necromancy has met with accidents, and, although I have been singularly lucky in this direction, I was fooled once and in a very peculiar way.

I paid a visit to the Paris Bourse before the asphaltum pavement had been put down around the square upon which that great monetary institution stands. The square was then paved with a regular block pavement, which, owing to the great travel, was frequently out of repair. While inside the edifice I had seen the stockbrokers and heard them howl in their frenzy of speculation, and my mind had wandered off in altogether a different direction after I got out and stood on the broad granite stairs of the temple of Mammon with a few of the stockbrokers, friends of mine, who had gathered around me and asked me to "do something." A gang of workmen stood directly before us, and one of the stockbrokers said, "Why don't you play a trick on them?" I thought I would. I walked down the broad stairs among the pavers and extracted from under one of the cobble-stones a 100-franc gold coin, which is about the size of one of our double eagles. Instead of being amazed, the paver simply looked at me and said, "*moitié*," meaning half. There was a law, at least at that time, in France, that the finder should have half of anything found. I, naturally, did not want to give up half, and I thought it would be a good thing to find another coin, so as at least to show the fellow that it was a trick, and straightway I put my hand down again and brought out a five-franc piece. The paver looked at me again, his face wreathed in smiles this time, and once more he said, "half," which would be 52½ francs, rather a good day's earnings. Well, as I did not seem willing to give up

half, as he wanted, he began to talk loud. I then changed my tactics, explaining to him that it was a trick ; and to illustrate it I picked up a five-centime coin of the reign of Louis Philippe (an old pocket-piece I happened to have with me), but even this failed to satisfy the workman, and his wild gesticulations and loud talk having collected more than 500 or 600 people around us, I thought it best to compromise with him. But no, he would listen to no compromise ; he hung to his rights tenaciously, and I was compelled to give him half, not alone of the 100-franc piece, but of the five-franc piece as well, and then he insisted upon having even half of the 10-sou piece.

It takes either a very stupid fool or an exceedingly clever man to get ahead of a prestidigitator, and of the two I am inclined to believe that the fool is by far the more dangerous.

In 1863, when this country was engaged in its great conflict, I happened to be in Constantinople, and the Sultan offered me the sum of five thousand dollars in good Turkish gold, which I finally made up my mind to accept.

Towards evening a gorgeously uniformed escort came to my hotel and I was driven to one of the great palaces overlooking the Golden Horn. It was April, and one of those lovely evenings that one sees in the Orient, as one looks across the beautiful waters that divide Europe from Asia.

I was brought into a room, and in a few seconds all my handsomely uniformed escorts vanished. The scene around me, however, was so beautiful that I scarcely noticed their absence, until two Turks, each six feet high, and dressed in the garb of the primitive Arabs, stood before me. One carried a chibouk beautifully scented with rose water, while the other had in his hand a little gold salver, upon which were bits of charcoal ignited, a gold coffee pot, and a tiny cup and saucer. The Turk carrying the pipe moved it slowly from side to side, and I saw that the bowl of it was filled with golden-colored tobacco. The whole room was perfumed by the smell of it, and such an aroma I knew could only come from the leaf grown on Mount Athos, the purest and most fragrant tobacco in the world.

All this, of course, was very beautiful to me, and I felt that I could really enjoy a whiff of the tobacco, but at the same time a lingering suspicion came into my head that there might be just a little bit of opium or some such drug in my pipe, and that instead

of my doing a little sleight of hand for the Sultan, the Sultan was going to do a little sleight of hand with me. Sultans have been known to amuse themselves in that way. My mouth really, as I have said, watered for a puff of the golden weed, and the pipe looked tempting, with its amber tip and its bowl beautifully carved with Arabic designs. I made all kinds of gesticulations to the pipe bearer that I did not want to smoke. He pushed the pipe, however, upon me, being extremely polite all the while, but still acting with a persistency that showed me I had to do something. After I had taken one puff, which I thought was sufficient, the other Turk handed me from the golden salver, a very fine porcelain cup filled with ebony black Mocha coffee. The tobacco was delicious, the coffee very tempting, but for some reason my heart beat against my ribs, and the suspicion darted through my mind that I was about being drugged. Quick as thought I took the cup in one hand and the pipe in another, then presto! change! both vanished through the air and two small snakes appeared in my hand. The look of amazement and astonishment that settled on the faces of the two Arabs was indescribable. They looked up at the ceiling, magnificently painted by some celebrated French artist, they looked at the rug which was thick and of the finest of the Orient, then they looked at me with even more astonishment, then they salaamed before me as they would have done before their ruler, and both of them got out of the way about as quickly as I had made the pipe and the cup of coffee disappear.

While I was laughing inwardly at their speedy disappearance, one of the chamberlains entered and gave me to understand in French that I was to appear before his august sovereign. He led the way to a magnificent hall gloriously decorated with all the emblems of Orientalism, and I was shown to a raised platform covered with red carpets and hung around with damask draperies. The room was one of those open rooms that are so well known in Turkey, in which there are no doors, but great big circular arches on all sides hung over with silken curtains.

The first thing I did when I got on the platform was, naturally, to look for my audience, but only one person sat in the middle of the room, an elderly, portly gentleman with a nicely trimmed black beard and a red fez. I at once recognized his august Majesty, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, and he in

return, with a twinkle of his coal-black, brilliant eye, gave me a sign of recognition, which I supposed was a signal for me to proceed. From every arch and opening in the walls, however, came faint whisperings, which intuitively told me that while my audience in the front consisted of only one, there were a number concealed behind every bit of silk and every pillar. I afterwards found that I had appeared before over 500 persons, including the entire harem ; and I may as well say I did not like it.

There is a magnetism that a large and enthusiastic audience fills me with. Everything goes smoother under such conditions, while to have a secret audience watch me, and only one man in the front, makes me ill at ease. I was a very young man, and it was my first appearance before so powerful a potentate.

I went through a number of experiments, which seemed to please the Sultan very much. He paid as much attention to me and was as anxious as a small boy, and I could see in the twinkle of his eye that he was trying to fathom the mystery of my black art. He failed, however, and before I left Stamboul I was commanded to appear before him on his pretty yacht, which usually takes him every pleasant evening from Constantinople to the opposite shore of Asia. On this magnificent pleasure vessel I also had an experience.

During the passage we became more familiar, and I was brought into close contact with the Sultan and noticed that he had a most magnificent watch, which he consulted and handled as if it were the apple of his eye. This, of course, was a good thing for me, for, as I was performing before him personally, it was not etiquette to take anything from the audience. I therefore asked him to take out his watch and show it to me, which he did. I then said, "Will your Imperial Majesty allow me to throw the watch overboard ?" He laughed at first, but a second afterwards his brow darkened, and he looked just a little bit as if he were offended with me for making the request. "If," said I, "I do not return the watch to you exactly as you give it to me, you can put me in irons for the rest of my life if you want to." The peculiar angry look that for a second had passed over his face vanished, and while all of his attendants stared at me and expected the Sultan to have me arrested at once, he seemed to take it seriously, and I have no doubt that if I had not returned the watch I would have been

put in irons. The Sultan, however, was a brave man, and after looking me straight in the eye with a piercing glance for a second, handed the watch to me, and I instantly threw it into the rippling waves of the Bosphorus. The yacht careened over, for every individual, from the cabin boy on the forecastle to the Sultan himself astern, rushed to the side and looked overboard after the watch. I felt that if anything went wrong with this trick I certainly should be put in irons; but I called for a fishing line, and instead of showing my anxiety at once proceeded to do a little fishing, while every one looked at me, not so much with astonishment as with pure disbelief in my ability to recover the watch, which was not only one of the things in the world the Sultan liked, but was worth a great deal more than any watch I myself had ever seen. My fishing, however, happened to be prosperous, for in a few minutes I drew up a little shiner and landed him safely on deck. I brought it before the Sultan, took out my pocket knife, ripped open the fish and presented the watch to His Majesty, in, of course, exactly the same condition as it was when he handed it to me. Turks, as a rule, are not very demonstrative, and I found in after life that to make a Turk laugh heartily is impossible. They smile, look pleased, and with their daintily pointed nails pick their beards, but on this occasion every Turk, from the Sultan and his blue-blooded pashas to the sailors in the forecastle, sent up one howl of delight that floated over the beautiful Golden Horn and re-echoed from the hills of Asia. You may guess how I did this, and I was very much pleased with myself, for the whole entertainment was a great success.

As I said before I was a very young man then, and my heart really beat with joy when I woke up the next morning and found that Constantinople spoke of nothing but "Herrmann, the Great." In every kiosk, on every street, and in every bazaar there was nothing talked of but the wizard and the watch, and I was just thinking that I owned not alone Turkey, but all of Asia Minor, when I was awakened rather abruptly to the reality of the situation. After having breakfasted, feeling very much satisfied with myself, I looked over the balcony and saw that I was the observed of all observers. The attendant informed me that his Imperial Majesty had deigned to send a message to me. I at once, in a grand and eloquent manner, instructed the slave to admit his

Majesty's despatch-bearer. I stood in the middle of the room, expecting he would salaam to the greatest man on earth at about that time. Well, he entered and he salaamed, and put a bag loaded with five thousand piastres before my feet, and over his head he handed me an envelope on the outside of which were numerous hieroglyphics, which, of course, I did not understand. I tore open the envelope quickly, and imagined that some new honors had been showered upon me. To tell the truth I had an idea that I would be made a commander of the Medjidie. The message that met my eyes, in pure French, was, "You are advised to leave Constantinople instantly." That was all; nothing more and nothing less. I had before been in Mohammedan countries and knew to a nicety what it meant. I looked at the slave and dismissed him not quite as grandly as I received him, and looked out of the window where I saw an English steamer puffing the blackest kind of black smoke from its funnel. I knew it belonged to a line of English boats which passes south of Greece, and went either to Suez or Alexandria, it mattered not to me which. I made up my mind that I would catch that steamer if I had to leave my baggage behind, and I did. I had done too much, and, alas! had become dangerous.

I have a great many times visited Turkey since then, and have always received the most courteous treatment and attention, but Turkey was not then what Turkey is now.

In March, 1885, while in Madrid, I appeared at the Sasuella Theatre quite successfully, for the house was filled every evening with hidalgos and noble señoras, and King Alphonso XII. was kind enough to view my performance from a box. He was so pleased that I was asked to the palace, and knowing him to be a great sportsman, I presented him with a silver-mounted saddle which I had brought with me from Buenos Ayres. He was exceedingly kind, and after I had performed a mathematical trick with cards, which pleased him greatly, he kept asking me continually if he could not be of some service to me. At first I did not accept, but a little while afterwards I thought it would be a great thing if I could make the King of Spain my confederate in a trick. He consented, laughingly, and it was so arranged that from the stage I was to ask one of the audience to write a number, when the King was to get up and say, "I will write it,"

and do it. Of course, with such a confederate, the trick was accomplished with the greatest effect, because my audience was exceedingly intelligent, and one that had seen some of the very best sleight of hand tricks, for at that time necromancy was studied for amusement in almost every noble family on the Spanish Peninsula.

This formed the first part of my entertainment before his Royal Highness, and I went back to the platform to my colored man, whom I had brought from America, and who became pretty well known all over the world as "William." Mrs. Herrmann had coached the darkey assiduously as to how to treat the King should he address him. He was told to bow in the most polite manner and say "Yes, Your Majesty," or "No, Your Majesty." In going behind the screen, the King followed me, but got there before me. William was leaning against some paraphernalia, and as the King was not in gala costume, the darkey naturally did not recognize him. In fact when the King addressed William, he answered him in the curtest manner, and the poor darkey almost fell dead when he found whom he had addressed. The King laughed very heartily, and whispered in my ear that this was a nice way to treat a confederate; and this led me to make up my mind to do a trick which would so astonish the King as to take it out of his mind that he had been a confederate of really great value. The first thing I did in beginning the second part of my performance was to take a blank piece of paper. This I handed to the King, asking him to sign it at the bottom. He did so readily, and the paper was passed from hand to hand and given to me. I conjured up all the spirits that have been or will be, and lo, and behold! the paper was closely written from the top to the place where His Majesty's signature was affixed. It was handed back to him, and, while he laughed very heartily, he said, "I will not deny my signature to this document, which appoints Alexander Herrmann prestidigitator to the King of Spain, and, as the spirits have done so, I heartily acquiesce."

The life of the prestidigitator is not, however, wholly devoted to sovereigns, and there are some incidents in his history that are rather unpleasant. One of these happened soon after I left Constantinople.

I had mapped out a tour of Northern Africa, and landed in Algeria. There were no railroads there then, and I had to travel,

as I did in India and South America, on horseback. After appearing successfully in some of the towns near the coast I started boldly for the interior, and in a short time encountered a tribe of Arabs, who made me a prisoner, and, in spite of all my gesticulations and attempted explanations, tied me to a tree with the evident intention of putting me to death. It was a situation in which I hope never to be placed again, but I was young and full of spirit, and I thought the best thing for me would be to do something that would so favorably attract their attention as to cause them to postpone, even for a little while, their rifle practice.

Algeria being in the possession of France, some one of the tribe, I fancied, would know enough of French to understand me. I had for some time before been practising a trick which consisted in having a gun levelled and fired at me, and catching the ball; and by some great luck I had a few of the bullets with me.

I began to laugh, as loud as I could, in the manner my journalistic friends call Mephistophelian, and loudly proclaimed that my life was charmed, and that not one of the assembled Arabs' bullets could reach me. A few of the old greybeards went aside to talk the matter over, and as I was tied up there I could not help thinking that the Arab is one of the most intensely aristocratic races in the world. They stood before me in flowing white gowns, magnificent, haughty, athletic men, and as I watched them I felt that this race looked the same as in the days of Abraham. I had, however, but a few minutes to think, for four stalwart young fellows were told off to kill me. One fired and I laughed even louder than I had before and spat out the bullet on the ground. Then the others fired, and each bullet aimed at me fell from my lips as did the first. Then came the reaction that usually follows in cases like this with semi-savage races. They thought me a god. They gathered together all the things they had taken from me. They brought cool milk, and dates newly picked, and showed me all the courtesies for which the Arabs are so justly celebrated, and when the sun had sunk down over the sand mounds, they escorted me to another town closer to civilization, and made me a present of the handsomest Arabic gun now in my possession.

A. HERRMANN.

BUSINESS IN PRESIDENTIAL YEARS.

BY CHAS. STEWART SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

IT IS the plain teaching of history that a long lease of power and a strong government are absolutely essential to the execution of great and far-reaching plans.

The historic monuments of the remote past like the Pyramids, the Colosseum, the temples, and public highways, which after the lapse of centuries still excite the wonder and admiration of mankind, were the work of great kings and governments that, in the exercise of absolute power, concentrated the whole force of their subjects upon the object to be obtained, often with slight regard to the value of human life or to the rights of individuals. The erection of the great cathedrals of the middle ages by the voluntary contributions of the masses, prompted by fanatical or superstitious religious emotions, is the only exception to this iron law of progress which had been the rule of the world's advance up to the time of the dissolution of the feudal régime.

The political economist who writes the history of material progress in the latter half of the nineteenth century must admit that this old power of kings to produce great public works has been transferred to companies, corporations, syndicates and trusts with enormous aggregations of capital. No one man is powerful enough to build a Pacific Railroad, and these latter-day associations are the legitimate successors of the ancient monarchs ; they represent the spirit of this age, and without them progress would be retarded indefinitely. While these great corporations have acquired in the United States enormous wealth and influence, and while they have been at times, like their predecessors, indifferent to, and negligent of, the rights of the people, and have required the strong arm of the law to compel their observance of public obligations, still they have, upon the whole, deserved well

of the country and contributed immensely to its increase in wealth and power. Wise legislation, such as the establishment of railroad commissions and the proper regulation of trusts, has guarded public interests.

Associated capital is, however, proverbially timid and conservative. It demands stability as a condition of freedom of action; it fears revolutionary legislation, which produces uncertainty in commercial and industrial circles. It prefers to adapt itself to bad laws even, rather than be subject to constant and radical changes.

No experienced man will deny that the recurrence of a Presidential election every four years is one of the prominent disturbing features in the business world; inasmuch as the great political parties who strive to rule the country must necessarily prepare for the contest twelve months in advance, we have in effect one year in four of this periodical interruption, with its consequent damage to business interests.

Nothing is more common than the remark of business men that "this is the year for election of the President, and we cannot expect the usual amount of business." We have a complete illustration of this unsettling effect in the position of the two great parties as defined in the platforms of the late conventions at Minneapolis and Chicago. The Republican party declares emphatically its purpose to maintain the existing policy of protection of American manufacturers and wage earners. The Democrats with equal emphasis stigmatize protection "as robbery and unconstitutional," and they promise a tariff for revenue only, if they come into power. The election of President will decide which policy will prevail, for the next Congress is likely to be in harmony with the newly-elected President. Both parties are confident of success. The majority either way will be small, with the possibility of a radical change in the tariff, and the consequent uncertainty as to the future. No prudent business man will engage in new enterprises of large moment—he will prefer to shorten sail and await the result of the election. The importer will be cautious if he conceives there is a prospect of lower duties upon his merchandise, and the manufacturer will not add to his machinery if he fears that free trade will ruin his business.

Happily both parties are now substantially agreed, if we can

trust the party platforms, in favor of honest money, and upon the maintenance of the existing parity between gold and silver. The craze for the free coinage of silver, like the old greenback mania, has met with sudden death. I predict that the next Congress will be wise enough to stop the monthly purchase of four million ounces of silver, and thus save the government from the disgrace and disaster of a premium upon gold. This Presidential election will also decide the financial policy of the United States for a long term of years. The international silver conference may give the world some useful information, but it will not cause the re-monetization of silver in England or Germany.

The full duration of an English Parliament is limited to seven years, and the Republic of France has fixed its Presidential term at eight years. In my judgment it would be desirable to lengthen the term of office of the President of the United States to eight years and render the incumbent ineligible to reëlection. If we have a worthy President, the lengthened term would give the country the advantage which long experience gives to all professions, and would take away from him the temptation to manœuvre for reëlection. If a President should prove unacceptable to the country, we can confidently rely upon the representatives of the people in Congress to protect their interests.

The direct expenses of a Presidential election amount to many millions of dollars, and the indirect losses to the country in an exciting campaign by the retarding of business operations are incalculable. A shrewd political authority, accustomed to handle campaign funds, estimates that it will cost the two political parties one and a half million of dollars in New York State alone to conduct the coming campaign. The lengthening of the term to eight years would reduce such expenses and losses by one-half. It would be greatly to the advantage of our diplomatic service in the longer continuance in office of experienced men, and would also strengthen civil-service reform among all classes of employees, and save them from the temptations always incident, in a greater or lesser degree, to the frequent changes in the minor offices which follow in the wake of Presidential elections.

The professional politicians and the bosses would be likely to oppose such a change, and the hungry crowd who are waiting for federal appointments would raise the old cry of "An aristocracy of office holders," but the common sense of the

country will yet demand the stability and tranquillity which would come from a lengthened term of office for the Chief Magistrate of the United States.

Notwithstanding the vast financial and commercial interests at stake, dependent upon the results of the November Presidential election, and the fact that the issues are sharply defined and easily understood, there has never been, within the experience of men now living, a Presidential election when the two parties have made so little preparation for, and have shown so little interest in, the contest. While this state of affairs has created less disturbance than usual to business, yet considering that a change in the President may involve an entire change in the economic policy of the country, the absence of interest in the election is phenomenal.

The threatened visitation of cholera, though at this writing an unknown quantity, must be reckoned among the disturbing forces of this Presidential year. Already it is certain that immigration will be stopped for some months to come, and that our commerce with the great shipping ports of Europe will be seriously disturbed.

The recent sharp advances in rates of discount in Wall Street indicate distrust of the future, and it is apparent that money will be required in unusual amount during the prevalence of cholera in Europe to carry raw materials at home which usually find prompt markets abroad.

CHARLES STEWART SMITH.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF ENGLAND.

BY HENRY LABOUCHERE.

HAPPY is the nation that has no foreign policy. America is fortunate in this respect; we are not. Our people know nothing, and care nothing about external politics, but our statesmen are ever desirous to play a great part on the world's stage, and we are blessed with a number of scribes who are perpetually telling us that it concerns our honor to meddle in European politics, and that it is our mission everlastingly to increase the area of our empire.

During the last century, we expended untold millions in endeavoring to maintain what we are pleased to call the European equilibrium. At one moment, we were fighting with Austria against Prussia; at another we were siding with Prussia against Austria. When we were unable to waste our resources by joining with Germans against Germans, we fell out with France or with Spain. At the close of the century the French Revolution occurred. The continental monarchs leagued themselves against France, and we joined them. Then came the wars of the first Napoleon. We declined to recognize him as Emperor of the French; we drove his fleets off the ocean; we seized his colonies; we fought him in Spain and in Portugal; and we gave large subsidies to every continental power that could be induced to go to war with him. Finally, when, after his first abdication, he returned from Elba, we vanquished him at Waterloo, and insisted upon the French accepting that wretched creature Louis XVIII. instead of the Corsican *parvenu* as their sovereign. The only benefits that we reaped from this long succession of follies were a huge national debt and the undisputed possession of some very worthless islands. The treaty of Vienna, to which we were parties, was an atrocious document. The continental sovereigns disputed with each other for accessions

of territory without any consideration for the aspirations of the inhabitants of these territories. Spain fell under the dominion of the priests. Italy was handed over to the tender mercies of Austria. Poland was once more divided between Prussia, Austria, and Russia. Belgium and the Netherlands, hating each other, were united under one sovereign. Everywhere, reaction was triumphant, and the people were shackled. But our statesmen felt that they had materially aided in settling the European equilibrium on a firm basis, and rejoiced at their work. When, however, the monarchs of Austria, Russia, and Prussia grafted on the treaty of Vienna a "Holy Alliance," by which they mutually bound themselves to put down revolution wherever it raised its head, our statesmen, although expressing cordial sympathy, declined to join this new alliance, for by this time the English people had begun to doubt whether they had any great reason to be proud of the outcome of the long war against France.

When Charles X. was expelled from France the Belgians separated themselves from Holland; otherwise the partition of Europe remained as established by the treaty of Vienna until the first Italian war of Napoleon III. But our relations with Continental Europe had changed during this period. During most of this time Lord Palmerston was our foreign minister. The cry of peace, economy and reform had been raised, and Lord Palmerston was aware that any minister who dragged us into a war for a matter that did not concern us would lose the support of the nation. In home politics he was a Conservative; in foreign politics he was a Radical. He made himself the ally of all continental Liberals, and professed himself the friend of all "rightly struggling" to be free. But his friendship took the form of dispatch writing, and he was wise enough not to allow it to involve us in war. In words he was a prodigious swaggerer, and this flattered our national pride. I can remember the patriotic glow that we felt when he insisted upon Greece granting a vast indemnity to a man called Pacifico, who claimed to be an Englishman, and whose crockery had been broken, and what Roman pride expanded our breasts when he announced on this occasion that an Englishman, in whatever country he might find himself, had only to say "*Civis Romanus sum*," in order to be safe from injustice and to get a fortune if his pots and pans suffered harm.

A personal feud existed between Lord Palmerston and the

Austrian statesmen, and he regarded the Prussian statesmen as siding with our court in its anxiety to subordinate England to the exigencies of the vague Germanism of the Prince Consort. This threw him on the side of France and of Russia. He held, however, to our old policy of bolstering up the Turkish Empire, and eventually we were landed in the Crimean war—a war, senseless in its aims, which cost us much blood and treasure. In the meantime, the party of non-interference in continental politics had increased in strength, and it finally dominated the Liberal policy. Our armaments were reduced, and we left the continental powers to settle their disputes without meddling in their quarrels. But the demon of interference only slept. It was still the doctrine of the Tories, and Lord Beaconsfield became its exponent. When Russia advanced into Bulgaria to free the Bulgarians from the intolerable oppression of the Turks, he sided with Turkey, and he only did not force us into war with Russia, in order to rivet the Turkish yoke on the subject nationalities inhabiting her territory, because the energetic protests of Mr. Gladstone brought home to the country the wickedness and folly of such a course of action.

Mr. Gladstone is not, however, himself, an absolute supporter of non-interference. He holds that we ought to act with the great continental powers in order to secure what he terms the "European concert." I have never quite understood how far he pushes this doctrine of a European concert. Of course, if all countries come to a united opinion united action follows. But if there be a disagreement, and some take one side and some another, with the result of an appeal to the arbitrament of force, we should undoubtedly find ourselves in a somewhat false position, if we declined to stand by those with whom we might be in agreement.

Lord Beaconsfield's defeat at the polls in 1880 was mainly due to a reaction against his aggressive foreign policy. He had involved us in a war with the Afghans in Asia, and in South Africa with the Zulus. In both he had failed, and these checks, coupled with the growing feeling that these wars might have been avoided, destroyed his popularity. When he was succeeded by Mr. Gladstone it was fully understood that we were to revert to peaceful ways, and that the British Empire was so large that any further extension would be a cause of weakness rather than of strength. But Lord Beaconsfield had already commenced meddling in Egypt. A number of financial houses had advanced

money to the ruler of Egypt at usurious interest. These advances had been converted into public loans, some of the bonds of which the financial houses held themselves, and some of which they had foisted off on the public. Owing to misgovernment in Egypt, and to reckless financing, the bonds had greatly fallen in value and the loanmongers had sufficient influence with Lord Beaconsfield to induce him to send out a financier to Egypt in a quasi-official position to endeavor to set matters right. First, a Mr. Cave was sent, then Mr. Goschen, late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a gentleman, who, as a partner in the firm of Goschen & Frühling, had been actively concerned in Egyptian loanmongering. Mr. Goschen placed the Khedive under tutelage, deprived him of all power, and made an arrangement by which almost the entirety of the taxes was paid directly into a treasury under European control to serve as interest on the bonded debt, with the result that the Khedive Ismail was dethroned because he declined to carry out the arrangement, and his son was raised to the throne.

When Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister in 1880, the Khedive was a mere puppet in our hands, huge salaries were paid to English and French controllers, the entire future of the country was subordinated to paying interest on a debt, the far greater portion of which had gone into the pockets of needy and greedy financiers. The situation was so monstrous that the uprising under Arabi Pasha followed. Our fleet and the French fleet were sent to Alexandria. The English admiral threatened to open fire on the forts defending that town if they were not dismantled, but the French admiral declined to take part in these high-handed proceedings. As the Egyptians refused to dismantle, fire was at once opened from our ships and Alexandria was bombarded. Mr. John Bright at once withdrew from the cabinet, and probably Mr. Gladstone was himself as surprised at what had occurred as was Mr. Bright. But unfortunately Mr. Gladstone accepted the accomplished fact, and as one crime inevitably leads to another, it was determined to crush Arabi and to occupy the country.

In order to allay the jealousies of the continental powers, we asked them to give us a mandate, and this was given, on the distinct and absolute assurance that our occupation would only be temporary. Armed with this mandate, our troops poured into

Egypt. The Egyptian troops were, of course, easily vanquished, and the entire country fell into our hands. Arabi and his principal supporters were packed off to Ceylon, and the British Resident became virtually ruler of Egypt, with British troops to enforce his will. Thus we drifted into our occupation of Egypt: the initial step was taken with no profound political aim, but solely to enable a gang of financiers to secure their booty. We are still there in defiance of solemn pledges publicly given to Europe, to a certain extent for the sake of the financial gang, the members of which are alive, pushing, and influential, and to a certain extent, in order to retain our hold upon the Suez Canal; and we hypocritically justify this violation of good faith on the ground that we are gradually teaching the Egyptians to govern themselves, and that, in the meanwhile, we are governing the country better than they would be likely to govern it themselves, although why we should conceive it our mission to educate and rule over Egyptians any more than Chinese no one has ever satisfactorily explained. The whole thing is a curious exemplification of the fatal consequences of one false step and the difficulty of withdrawing from it.

When Lord Salisbury succeeded Mr. Gladstone as Prime Minister in 1886, he returned to power with a full determination to act on the traditional Tory principles in respect to our relations with continental states. He is unquestionably a man of great intellectual power. He saw that public opinion would not allow him too brutally to reverse the policy of his predecessor. But there is a vein in his character that renders it a positive pleasure to him to say one thing and to do another. With non-intervention on his lips, he has perpetually interfered in matters that in no way concern us; and with assurances that our empire is large enough already, he has extended its area wherever he could get an opportunity. He cares little about domestic politics, but he aspires to play a great part on the world's stage. The dominant feeling that actuates him is hatred of Russia and of France. Soon after his accession to power, a German Prince was ejected from the throne of Bulgaria, and another German Prince was placed on the throne. So far as regarded us, and so far as regarded the Bulgarians, it was tweedledum and tweedle-dee. But Russia, Lord Salisbury thought, had been at the bottom of the change. For more than a year, there-

fore, he penned despairing appeals to Austria, Germany, and Italy, imploring them to join in a crusade to reëstablish German Prince number one upon the Bulgarian throne, and he only desisted when this Prince insisted upon marrying a lady who was not of royal birth, and when he discovered that number two was more distasteful to Russia. If he had had his way, Europe would have been involved in war in order to maintain on the throne of Bulgaria Prince Alexander of Battenburg.

The Triple Alliance was Lord Salisbury's great opportunity. After the annexation of Alsace and of a portion of Lorraine by Germany, the aim of Prince Bismarck was to secure allies in the event of France's seeking to regain her lost provinces, and in any case to hinder France from forming an alliance with any other power, which might, in the event of war, range the power on the side of France. For a time he effected this object by playing off the jealousies of Austria and Russia, and induced these two powers to unite with Germany in what he was pleased to call a "league of peace." When Russia broke loose from this alliance he turned to Italy. That kingdom has all the weaknesses of a *parvenu*. It was delighted to be treated as a great power. It had no quarrel with France, and there was not the remotest probability of France attacking it. But M. Crispi, then its Prime Minister, fell under the blandishments of the tempter. He had, however, the sense to see that, if Italy joined in a war against France and sent troops to Germany, the Italian coasts would be at the mercy of the French fleet. Prince Bismarck therefore appealed to Lord Salisbury to give Italy assurances that, in the event of war resulting from an alliance with Austria and Germany, England would protect her from the consequences. These assurances were given, but what their precise nature was has never been known. At first Lord Salisbury, when questions were asked in Parliament, boldly denied that he had done anything. When, however, M. Crispi and other Italian statesmen asserted that Italy had joined the Triple Alliance because she knew that she could count upon England coming to her aid in case of need, Lord Salisbury had to change his tone, as otherwise he would have been confronted with his own assurances. During the last session of Parliament, consequently, he fell back upon ambiguous phrases, from which, however, it might be gathered either that he had pledged the Tory party to Italy, or that he had assured Italy that in the

event of a war England would actually interfere to maintain the *status quo* in the Mediterranean. The Liberal party, however, met these disingenuous utterances by taking note that whatever assurances had been given they had not been revealed to Parliament, and that, therefore, however binding they might be on Lord Salisbury and his party, they were not binding on the country.

While Lord Salisbury compromised us, so far as he dared, in Europe by an alliance with Austria, Germany, and Italy against France and Russia, he annexed vast territories in Africa. The possession of the Cape Colony has been fruitful of trouble to us—it has involved us in numerous wars, most of which were promoted by the colonists for their own aims. It is our fashion to encourage missionaries to introduce themselves into uncivilized regions. No sooner do they get there than they meddle with temporal matters and get into trouble. Then speculators deem that a new field is opened out to them and they import spirituous liquors. After this come gold prospectors; they purchase for a trifle mining claims from some native chief, and bring out their claims as companies in England with a huge bogus capital. Agriculturists follow in the track, and lay hold of farms. Finally the country is placed under British protection, and then comes annexation, when the last state of the native is far worse than the first.

In South Africa, the Dutch element is the prominent factor. Provided that neither the Imperial government nor the colonial government interferes with them they are apathetic, and the consequence is that, although recent investigations have revealed much official corruption in Canada, the government of Canada compares favorably in the matter of purity with that of the Cape Colony. To our Imperialists it is a matter of reproach that we allow the Dutch Transvaal Republic to exist in Africa. We annexed it once, but the annexation was brought about so fraudulently, and these Republicans (who are men of war) showed themselves so blind to the honor of being British subjects that we restored to them their independence; greatly to the indignation of our Imperialists, who have not ceased to curse Mr. Gladstone for doing this act of justice.

During the present tenure of office of the Tories, there has been a rush of European powers to Africa, and the Black Continent has been parcelled out amongst them. It is needless to say that we have secured our share of the spoil, and thus we have become

possessed of large territories in Central Africa, mainly consisting of jungle, and inhabited by tribes that either enslave or eat each other. The basis for this partition was what is termed the *Hinterland* doctrine, which means that whenever a European Power has established itself on the coast, it has a right to all land behind it. In the case of Germany and France we admitted this doctrine, but when Portugal asserted it, we explained that, as the Portuguese are not sufficiently awake to the wickedness of slavery, and as they have never used their opportunities either to sell rum to the natives or to Christianize them, we have a right to take such portions of the Dutch *Hinterland* as we think may suit us.

Our mode of exercising some sort of sway over these vast districts is a curious one. We grant a charter to some speculators, securing to them the exclusive right to make laws, to levy taxes, and to trade within the district. Of these chartered companies there are several. The most important is that called the Chartered Company of South Africa. Some years ago an Englishman named Rhodes betook himself to South Africa. He was a company manager, and he brought out various companies that proved more remunerative to their promoters than to their shareholders. When diamonds were discovered at Kimberley Mr. Rhodes went there, and with considerable skill consolidated all the companies into one great monopoly. He thus became a South African financier of the first water. There is a country in South Africa called Matabeleland that is ruled over by a powerful chief called Lobengula, and this chief has some vague claim of sovereignty over another territory called Mashonaland. An emissary was sent to Lobengula in order to obtain a general mining concession over these two territories, which together are of about the size of France. He returned with the concession signed by Lobengula, although that ruler has since pleaded that he did not know what he was signing. Be this, however, as it may, the concession fell into the hands of Rhodes and half a dozen kindred spirits. Rhodes came over to England and asked the government to grant him a charter over the two territories. At first the government declined, but when he associated with his scheme the Dukes of Fife and of Abercorn the government proved more pliable and the charter was granted. In the meantime the Cape Colonists testified their admiration of his financing genius by making him

their Prime Minister. The charter having been secured, a company was formed, which bought the concession for four million pounds, paid, of course, in shares. This company let their "rights" to a second company, called the South African Chartered Company, on condition that this second company pay to the first company half of all the profits and take upon itself all the expenditures. One million pounds was subscribed to the chartered company, and it is now the only power in these vast territories.

Every English subject entering these territories is forced to sign an undertaking to obey the laws of the company, and puffs are diligently circulated that Mashonaland is another Ophir, with a view to selling the shares of both companies to investors. At first the shares were at a high premium; but, as no gold was discovered in paying quantities, the price of the shares fell. To meet this the promoters, having heard that there was gold in the neighboring territories belonging to Portugal, organized a raid, and what was deemed the richest portion of these territories was seized. Vainly the Portuguese protested, and finally they were bullied by the British government into making over to the company a portion of the territory that had been acquired in this filibustering fashion. At present the shares of the parent company are unsaleable, and those of the Chartered company are only maintained above par by stock-jobbing processes, and the major portion of its funds has been expended, with little prospect of the outlay ever being recouped. I have entered somewhat in detail into these proceedings, because they exemplify how the area of the British Empire is extended under a Tory government, and how such a government collusively plays into the hands of the few in their financial designs upon the money of the many, provided that amongst the few are Dukes and such like people. If the amount of money expended in African wars, the annual drain on the Exchequer for a police force, and the sums lost in rotten companies brought out in consequence of our annexations in Africa, were added up, the total would far exceed any benefit that we either have derived, or that we are likely to derive, from our territorial property in that continent.

In Asia, we own India and we have other possessions. India is in many ways valuable to us. But our Imperialists are in perpetual dread of its being attached by Russia. That empire

stretches across northern Europe and northern and central Asia. In central Asia there were a number of half-civilized Khanates, which were little better than robbers' dens. To the huge indignation of our Imperialists, these Khanates have been suppressed by Russia, whose territories are thus extended to the northern slopes of the range of mountains that form the northern frontier of India, and it seems actually to have been considered that a great belt of land ought never to have been reclaimed from barbarism, in order that our rule in India should not be endangered by the vicinity of any civilized power. Russia is now building railroads in this belt, and she is denounced by our Imperialists as though she were guilty of a crime.

A few years ago we were almost involved in a war with Russia, because that country laid claim to a place called Sarakoff, in the vicinity of Afghanistan. No one seemed exactly to know to whom Sarakoff belonged, or, indeed, where it precisely was. But it was urged that the possession of this mysterious place by Russia would furnish her with a basis for an invasion of India. At present I believe that Sarakoff is in the peaceful possession of the Czar, and even our most ardent Imperialists have forgotten its existence. Shortly after our outcry about Russian designs on this obscure tract of country, we proved our sincere disapproval of all Asiatic annexations by European governments by ourselves annexing Upper Burmah, and proclaiming as rebels any of the inhabitants who objected to becoming British subjects, and we dealt severely with all those who did not take heed to this proclamation. In Asia, indeed, as elsewhere, our doctrine is, that we have a divine mission to annex all land that we may lust after, but that any other power that does the same is guilty of an offence alike against the laws of God and of man.

This dread of Russia in India is at the bottom of the "Eastern question." In the north, Russia has no port that is open in winter. In the south her ports are limited to those on the Black Sea, of which Turkey has the key, and in common with the other great powers of Europe the Czar is a party to the treaty which forbids vessels of war to pass through the Dardanelles. That Russia should not extend her sway either in Europe or in Asiatic Turkey, or in Persia, and thus reach the open sea, has long been our traditional policy. On account of this we engaged in the Crimean war.

On account of this Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury preached a crusade against Russia, when a few years ago she was seeking to free the Christian nationalities in Roumelia from Turkish oppression. On account of this the Armenians are maltreated and Asia Minor is converted into a hell by the Turks. Lord Salisbury was led into a quasi-union with the Triple Allies by his personal sympathies and his antipathies, but he has frequently urged that this union with the Central Powers is desirable because they would join us in resisting Russian designs against Turkey, although, as a matter of fact, Germany, the leading member of the Alliance, has declared that no Pomeranian soldier shall ever give his life for Turkey; Austria would probably seek compensations were Russia to take Constantinople, and all three Allies would look on with calm indifference were Russia to make an advance into Asia Minor. Never has a traditional policy been more foolish or more costly. It is the very climax of absurdity; for Russia knows, that, whilst English statesmen may threaten, any English statesman who involved his country in a war to bolster up the sway of the Turk would at once be hauled from power by the people of England.

The actual position of our foreign relations was, therefore, this: Lord Salisbury was a warm friend of Germany, Austria and Italy, who have united together to restrain France or Russia from breaking the European peace. France and Russia have been brought together only through this counter alliance, and our sympathy with one of the trio of camps into which Europe is divided has naturally placed us in antagonism with the other camps. If a conflict ensued, Lord Salisbury had so compromised himself that we probably should have been dragged into it. During Lord Salisbury's tenure of office our navy and our army were largely increased, in order that he might have a backbone for his meddlesome aggressiveness, or, as he would put it, in order that the voice of England might be listened to, and that she might take her legitimate part in European complications. Fortunately his lordship and his party have reached the length of their tether. Since the general election he and they have ceased to trouble, and have been reduced to impotent denunciations of the Liberals for sacrificing the honor of the country, and destroying that very vague asset, her fealty.

What the Liberal foreign policy will be I cannot say, for, before

now, Liberals in this matter have been as foolish as Tories. What it ought to be is to follow the example of the United States : to leave the continental powers to quarrel and fight as they please ; to eschew further territorial aggrandizement ; to regard with satisfaction the collapse of Turkey; to withdraw from Egypt; to live in peace and amity with all mankind, and to let it be known that, so long as we are not attacked, we shall attack no one.

Our continuous occupation of Egypt, in defiance of our pledges, causes—and justifiably causes—the entire world to distrust our good faith, and we pay with our honor by this occupation without any countervailing advantage. Under a former administration of Mr. Gladstone's a naval and military commission *ad hoc* reported that, in the event of war, it would be impossible for us to send troops or merchandize through the Suez Canal, for the passage would remain open to neutral vessels, and our adversary might at any time induce some captain of a neutral ship to scuttle her during the passage and thus close the canal, whilst our hold over the Red Sea would prevent its being used by the adversary for purposes of war. If, therefore, it be admitted—and it seems that it is—that a state of war with a Mediterranean power would oblige us to send troops round by the Cape of Good Hope to the East and to use this route for our commerce, it is difficult to understand what military advantage we can claim from our hold on Egypt, for were we at war we should be obliged to send a fleet to hinder a hostile landing, and an army to defend the country in case the fleet should fail in this object.

It is often urged by our Imperialists that England can never adopt the sound non-interference policy of the United States, because we have colonies all over the world, and the United States has none. I should rather have thought that the argument tells the other way. Is it likely that Australia, Canada, and our other great colonies, would maintain their somewhat thin connection with us, were their commerce crippled because we prefer a Battenberg to the scion of some other princely family as the ruler of Bulgaria ? because we believe that our interests require that Christians should be misgoverned by Turks in Armenia or in Roumelia ? because a number of Shylocks in Egypt want their pound of flesh ? because some thieving, piratical company wants a few hundred square miles as a basis for swindling investors out of their money ? because Russia has laid hands on some obscure

robbers' den in Central Asia, or because France may seek to re-acquire Alsace and Lorraine? No. Radical Great Britain, and Colonial Greater Britain will have none of this measure, and as the Liberal party has become the Radical party, any "superior" Liberal statesmen who may wish to play such pernicious antics will find himself deserted by his followers.

The Radical policy is to cut adrift from continental jealousies and quarrels; to make all respect us by respecting all; to sympathize with the oppressed in all parts of the world, but to reserve our energies for the task of bettering the lot of the suffering millions within our own territories; to have an army and navy sufficient for defence, but not for aggression; to be ready, if unfortunately we have a dispute with any foreign power, to refer it to arbitration; and never to allow ourselves to be diverted from domestic reforms by endeavors to maintain that most shifty of shifty things—the European equilibrium,—or to remedy wrongs abroad in order that privilege may pass unperceived at home. Our home is large enough in all conscience. A British statesman has work enough to do within the limits of our empire, without arrogating to himself the mission of a Providence outside it.

The fault of our people is that they care so little for foreign politics that they pay no attention to them. In this way they have often allowed their pilots to let the vessel of state drift into war. Henceforward we must keep a closer watch on the man at the wheel, and if he shows the slightest tendency to carry the vessel into dangerous waters, we must replace him. During the last two centuries we have had many wars. We are now paying interest on a huge debt which has been heaped up in order to defray the cost of this policy of war. In no single case were these wars the result of our being attacked. In every case we were either the aggressors or we were fighting for matters that did not concern us. With this experience before us, and with the cost of our past follies still bound like a millstone around our necks, weighing on our shoulders, there is little probability of our people, now that power is in their hands, allowing our statesmen to repeat the errors of the past.

The Tory game has ever been to drag a red herring across the trail whenever the people are breast high for the reform of those domestic abuses by which Tories live and thrive. One reason

why we fought Napoleon for years was to hinder the advance of democracy at home. The short Parliament of 1885 was the most democratic that ever sat. This was met by all "moderate Liberals" going over to the Tory camp on the plea that Mr. Gladstone's recognition of the right of Ireland to self-government would disintegrate the empire. This red herring has served its turn in the last six years. When it is run down, the Tory red herring will be an appeal to patriotism and passion, and they will try to stave off the day of reckoning for peers, parsons, publicans, and all others who enjoy political or monetary privileges, by means of foreign war. The "masses," however, are now the the masters of the "classes." Our international pundits will continue to pen long-winded essays to show that our commerce will disappear, that our manufactured goods will remain unsold, and that London will be in the power of an enemy, if we do not interfere and meddle to hinder any territorial change in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, or Polynesia, and if we do not make it our business to see that "legitimate" rulers continue to misgovern subject races.

I have such an ardent faith in the common sense of the masses, that I do not think that these diatribes will influence their judgment, or that they will consent again to play the Tory game of foreign war, in order to lose all chance of playing the radical game of domestic reform. The one danger that we incur is that a Tory administration may again get into power by the accident of an accident, and that we may drift into belligerency without well knowing how we have got there.

Whether there will speedily be a war in Europe is a question that no one can answer, or rather one in regard to which no answer is worth the paper on which it is written. At no period since the era of the great Napoleon have there been such vast armies in Europe, and either the Continental powers must reduce their forces or they will soon, one and all, be ruined. The richest country is France, but there the taxation is enormous. Both Austria and Germany are comparatively poor ; Russia's credit is only maintained by the French being ready to buy its bonds ; Italy is practically bankrupt already, and, notwithstanding this, all these countries are engaged in an insane struggle to compete with each other in amassing the material to wage a successful war.

If war does occur it will not in all probability be entered into

of deliberate design. Some foolish word will be spoken; this will lead to further words. The passions will come into play, troops will be advanced to the respective frontiers of two states, then there will be a collision, and the whole of the continent will be in flames. One thing is certain: the present "armed peace" cannot eternally exist. Either the continent must bring it to an end by war or by reverting to a real peace policy. Were there a conflict between France and Russia on one side, and Austria, Germany, and Italy on the other, it is by no means certain that the latter would come out the victors. The French army is thoroughly reorganized, and the French soldiers, when properly commanded, are the best on the continent. Russia has an endless reserve from which to draw soldiers, and the Russians have more staying power than the Germans. On the other hand, if we are to judge by experience, the Austrians and the Italians make but poor soldiers, and the Germans, although probably their armies are more perfect, viewed as military machines, than any other in Europe, have lost many more battles than they have won, and one serious reverse would lead to the disintegration of the new German Empire.

The most dangerous man to the European peace is the German Emperor. He is a crack-brained Prussian lieutenant, and an Emperor by the irony of fate. His grandfather was under the delusion that he was the Vice-Regent of Providence as regards Germany; in this youth the illusion has taken the form that he is placed by Providence on the German throne to regulate not only the affairs of that country, but those of the entire world. He is flighty and unstable to an extraordinary degree. His idea of peace is that it should be a German peace imposed upon Europe. He seldom makes a speech without announcing that he will "smash" all who decline to accept his views, and at any moment he is capable of translating his words into deeds and dragging those who have been silly enough to become his allies into war.

The French will never permanently accept the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, but they are not likely to precipitate a struggle for the reacquisition of these provinces without the aid of some other power, and the only power likely to help them is Russia. But the Czar himself is so strongly disposed to peace that he would hesitate long before embroiling Europe in war with France as his ally. The Franco-Russian understanding, however, will in all proba-

bility lead the German Emperor to eschew all thought of setting out on a march to Paris in order to prevent France from becoming as strong as she formerly was; indeed the moment when such an expedition was possible has passed away. Austria, moreover, although she may have joined the Triple Alliance, will always discourage a resort to arms, and in Italy there is growing up so strong a feeling against the country being a party to this alliance, that it is doubtful whether any Italian minister could give effect to its stipulations, all the more, since the Italians have realized that they will obtain no material support from us.

Although, therefore, armed to the teeth, any continental power dreads war, not exactly knowing what may come of it. There are, however, so many "questions" in Europe, there is such rivalry and hatred between the continental powers—there are so many real causes for difference; the strain is so great, and the cost of huge armaments so enormous, that it is difficult to believe that some spark will not before long set this magazine of combustibles on fire.

H. LABOUCHERE.

THE HYGIENE OF THE ATMOSPHERE.

BY SAMUEL LOCKWOOD, PH. D.

THE popular judgment regards the snow and the air as emblems of immaculate purity. But if the former be melted in a vessel, and the water allowed to rest, its sediment will dispel the illusion. The snow in its descent has filtered the air, not only of visible substance, but also of some of its adulterant chemicals.

For a considerable depth, at least, the entire crust of the earth, excepting the crystalline rocks, is permeated with air. It is easy to find out pretty nearly what the weight and volume of this earth-air may be in a given known quantity of soil or mineral, taking a hundred cubic inches of air to weigh thirty-one grains. Suppose a quart vessel to be filled with earth, the weight being first determined. Let water be supplied until it will absorb no more. The air is now expelled, the increased weight is then ascertained, and the rest is simple. Thus we are confronted with the fact of an atmosphere which envelops our persons and which also penetrates the earth beneath our feet. This latter has been called by investigators the ground-air, and in some gravelly and sandy soils its volume is equal to fifty per cent.

The nether atmosphere, or ground-air, may, in spots, be the home of pestilential gases, due to putrescent matter in or on the soil, and known technically as miasmatic or malarial emanations. Such are usually swampy regions, but in every case the evil is superficial, and generally removable by man. Let us prefer to show the beneficent relation which the nether bears to the upper atmosphere, in their respective hygiene.

As the earth beneath is a laboratory for evolving nitrogen and making carbonic-acid gas, it thus becomes very largely the source of a food-supply to the roots of plants. It is also the chief aërial sustenance of all vegetation ; for it is constantly escaping at the surface of the ground. Were it to accumulate there it would be

disastrous to living things; so, albeit a much heavier gas, by the law of diffusion, or the kinetic force, it is rapidly disseminated and commingled with the air; yet, though greatly in the minority, every molecule of this gas scorns alliance with any molecule of the atmosphere proper. Thus is secured a dilution of the former, which, to the animal, is harmless, and to the plant beneficial.

With no straining after evidence of design, we may assert for Nature "a solemn league and covenant" in this one example of the conservation of the physical forces. Herein is also a beautiful illustration of the natural economics in hygienic chemistry. It is a quaternate compact. Thus with the correlation of forces as a quasi-constitution or basis of agreement, a mutual contract seems to have been entered into between four parties, securing equal and commensurate benefits. Of these, two of the parties in the alliance are organic, and two are inorganic. The atmosphere contributes of its opulence of oxygen, the vital gas, in conjunction with the essential nitrogen. On the oxygen the respiration of the animal depends; so it evolves carbonic-acid gas, which it contributes to the air for the support of the plant. So, too, the earth crust, with its ground-air, draws on the oxygen, and with its stored carbon also generates carbonic-acid gas, thus also as a solvent preparing plant food. But in this elaboration heat is evolved; so there are begotten thermal conditions of great advantage to the roots of the plant. For their contribution of carbonic-acid gas to the air, both the sentient animal and the insentient earth take oxygen in exchange. By this kinetic commerce the atmosphere maintains its normal balance of one part by volume of carbonic-acid gas to twenty-five hundred parts of air. And what about the fourth member in this righteous, though selfish compact—the plant? It has received generous nutriment from all three. Not to dwell on particulars, it returns to the air the oxygen and nitrogen, and to the earth the carbon. And this compact of conservation goes on in an increasing round of harmony, more practical far than the "music of the spheres."

And in this compact of the natural forces do we not see at least three remarkable facts? No loss of energy; no waste of material; and the minimum of cosmic wear. The common notion is that Mother Earth is throwing off the caloric of her deep fires, much as a prodigal consumes his substance. If I read the evidence correctly, it appears that the laboratory of the earth-rind, in its proc-

ess of using the ground-air, in converting the oxygen and carbon into carbonic-acid gas, is like a perpetual furnace ever making heat, because its fuel fails not. Hence the earth-rind, in this tireless energy of converting the oxygen of the ground-air, with the carbon stored in the crust, into carbonic dioxide, is a perpetual heat-generator, and unfailing furnace, because its fuel fails not. Hence the cooling of the globe by radiation of its internal heat has herein a considerable offset. So it seems supposable that if the refrigeration of Earth is in the cosmic plan, it is set for some æon in the future. Thus, as a home of life, the perpetuity of the sphere and the quality of its envelope are guaranteed.

The atmosphere is a vast, thirsty sponge ; and though we speak of dry air, it is never without vapor. The earth roots of the giant cactus in the burning plains are little else than grapnel anchors. Into the air it puts out fibrils, aërial roots, and these reach into and suck the vapor-laden air, as a moistened sponge.

The fact which bears on this is the weight of the air, for it is not imponderable. Moreover, its pressure is a variable quantity. In its normal state this pressure is comfortable. The discomfort, and sometimes danger, comes of the thermometric and the barometric changes ; for thus the molecules are brought closer together, and the great air-sponge is the more absorbent, thus more rapidly robbing the body of moisture and heat. From this increase of pressure comes the increase of absorbing power ; hence appears the difficulty of the problem how to ventilate dwellings without subjecting the occupants to a draft. In the winter we must warm our rooms artificially. But this means that we must heat the air we breathe. Now, this air, however pure it is, even if taken directly from the outer air, always contains dust, the consuming of which in heating the air will certainly produce some, however little, carbon monoxide.

Our plan does not require the giving in detail the names of the many substances which the chemist can detect in the air. Their proportion to the mass is so small that they may be compared to the rare gems in the mineral mass of the earth-rind. When the functions of oxygen, nitrogen and carbon are told, this set will embrace the chief essentials of the animal and the plant. But there is still one word about which very unwarrantable notions, if not a good deal of unnecessary mystery, exist. Many years ago Van Marum observed that the passage of the electric

spark through oxygen produced a pungent odor, and affected otherwise the known properties of this gas. In a word, it became altered oxyyen—or, technically, it took on an allotropic form. To be quite plain: A molecule of oxygen is a union or impact of two atoms of the element, while a molecule of ozone is a "combination" of three. But as the corroding energy of the triplet is many times that of the twin, the latter has been called relatively passive and the former active oxygen.

In 1840 Schönbein named it ozone, literally the smelling or pungent gas. He found it in the atmosphere, and advanced the idea of its connection with catarrhal diseases; but of this he gave no proof. Ozone is oxygen in its most active condition, having an active eroding and destructive energy—that is, a very greatly increased oxidizing power. It is destructive of germs or organisms in the air; and this energy over thickly-populated places, finding so much material for its exercise, is really turned upon itself, as if suicidal, for it becomes converted back to oxygen. Hence the paradox that, though plentiful in city air, ozone is even there a rare gas. The air of mountains and at the seashore contains ozone in some quantity. In forests, it can hardly be found except high up in the trees, it being restored to oxygen by its expended energy on the leaf or dying vegetation on the ground. In the air over most open fields it is also found, though a French *savant* was not able to find it higher than forty-six feet from the ground.

The air is tenanted with inorganic and organic forms of extreme subtilty, germs both quick and dead.

In the old practice, infectious diseases were too often considered due to a malign influence or principle in the air. Though malignly, the plague was "divinely" sent. But science has her occasional prophet, like a voice in the wilderness, foretelling, he knows not how, some truth which the delving *savant* will afterwards establish by discovery or demonstration. Hence far more interesting to me than he of fiction is the John Ward, preacher by ordination, and administrator of physic without dispensation, the Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon, from 1662 to 1681. His diary, written in Latin, obtained celebrity because of a bit of gossipy tradition which he tells, that Shakespeare died of a fever contracted in a carouse with two boon poets, Michael Drayton and Ben Jonson. But truly worthy of renown is a passage which contains the grand truth of modern pathology and

hygiene, the germ theory. As I have only seen it in the Latin, a translation must be given.

"There is a plague-producing poison flying through the air, a congeries of excessively minute animalcules, which, entering human bodies, either by the breathing passage, or the pores of the skin, gnaw and destroy these parts. And from these they fly to other bodies, or alight upon them in a similar way; and propagating like a contagion, they infect these others, gnawing and destroying them, as they did those bodies from which they came. . . . This poisonous presence, as above, has made many lie sick, not only of the plague, but also of other diseases"

With medicaments for body and spirit both, this John Ward, vicar, was an active worker in the "great pestilence" of 1665. Hence the allusion in the words "plague" and "plague-producing" is apparent. To-day, instead of "animalcule" we use the term "microbe," so indispensable to the new science, Bacteriology, which deals with the objects now regarded as the germs of disease.

How far the doctrine reaches is not yet determined; but it is indisputable that some contagious diseases are sown by the air. And this is true of the diseases of both animals and plants. Near my home was a grove of red cedars, and seven miles from the grove was an apple orchard. Early in the autumn the cedars were heavily weighted with an unsightly crop of fruit looking like stringy, or ragged oranges. It was a growth of the common cedar apple, a true fungus, known as a *gymnosporangium*, or one of the fungi which have naked spore-vessels. The next season the orchard was badly smitten with disease. Every tree looked as if scorched by fire; every leaf was brown instead of green, and had many eruptions of the epidermis like little boils. Each eruption was a tiny spore-filled cup of the fungus *ræstelia*. Now for a curious fact: for a long while fungologists regarded these two fungi as of genera so widely distinct as not to be cognate. It is now known that they represent stages in the life-career of one and the same species. The spores of the cedar apple, if sown on the leaves of the cedar, will not germinate; whereas, if sown on the apple tree, they will grow, but not into *gymnosperms*, or cedar fungi, but into *ræstelia*, the apple-leaf fungus. And, conversely, the spores of the *ræstelia* will not grow on the apple tree; but carried by the winds to the cedar tree, they will grow there and produce the true cedar apple.

Omnipresent in the atmosphere are the invisible spores of the fungi, known as the *torulacei*. They beget many of the moulds

and mildews seen on decaying vegetation. Some of these act also as ferments, decomposing vegetable and animal matter. Of this group, for good and evil, the air almost everywhere contains the spores of the *torula cerevisiæ* or yeast-fungus, literally the mother of vinegar, alcohol and leavened bread.

And in respect of those microbes of the atmosphere which are set down as germs of disease, it can hardly be doubted that their relation to the fungi is pretty close. They are really plants, mostly known under the generic names of *bacilli* and *bacteria*. They are usually rod-like in form, and so small as to be invisible, except with the skilful use of a well-equipped microscope. Each rod perpetuates its species, either by self-division or by spores. Generally these tiny sprites love darkness rather than light. Some seem set for goodness, and some for evil; for some are scavengers removing by fermentation or putrefaction, and others are propagators of disease. Their vitality is marvellous. They will come out of melting ice full of vigor for mischief, and the spores of some will resist the heat of water nearly to the boiling-point. As with us higher mortals, protoplasm is the life-stuff in these infinitesimals; and this instable substance will break up under much exposure to the oxidation of the atmospheric air, in sunlight. Yet the anthrax thrives and lives, long multiplying in the buried beast, and coming to the surface to be eaten with grass.

A fact of no common interest respecting these microbes is the diurnal fluctuations of their habitancy of the air. The presence of *bacteria* always rules high at about eight o'clock in the morning. Then begins a gradual decrease until their least presence for the day occurs at the meridian. This lasts for about one hour. Then a gradual increase sets in, and at about eight o'clock of the evening the maximum is again reached. Until about eleven o'clock, or near midnight, their number is considerable, and a great diminution occurs between that hour and three o'clock, when the number begins to rise, until at eight in the morning the maximum is again reached.

But besides these disease-originating organisms, the microbes, the atmosphere carries many other kinds of substance, which perform the rôle of irritants. Though the agents of great suffering, their action does not ordinarily imperil life. Let us consider this feature of the air-dust.

A distressing malady is *æstivis*, or hay-fever. Behind the disease

is a neurosis, or supersensitiveness of the nerve centres. The air passages have their mucous walls in a disordered condition, and in a state of tenderness not unlike that of the outer flesh when scalded or denuded of the skin. Hence, generally, air-dust of any kind is a painful irritant to the mucous surface. And probably this is especially true of the organic or vegetable matter in the air. As president of the United States Hay-Fever Association, it seemed my duty to try to throw some light on the question of the difference of the air in places where *æstivis* prevailed, and the regions sought as sanitaria being largely exempt from the malady. Possibly in these mountain retreats, owing to the resins of the balsam forests, peroxide of nitrogen, mistaken for ozone, is present. The air, too, is dryer and its average much cooler, all of which makes the summer climate more tonic. Yet it seemed to me that the chief factor was to be sought in the character of the air-dust itself. In a word, the instrumental work was less with the barometer and the thermometer than with the microscope.

Accordingly in August and September, at my retreat in the White Mountains, at an elevation of about 1,500 feet, I set traps to catch the contents of the air, instructing my son, by correspondence, to do the same at the same time at my home in New Jersey, at an elevation of nearly 300 feet above the sea. His daily catch was put away in an air-tight box to be studied on my return. My mountain catch was inspected with the microscope on each succeeding night. The New Jersey catch was, in time, carefully studied, and compared with that from the mountains, and many careful drawings were made. These traps were simply strips of glass three inches long and one wide, each before exposure, being smeared with pure glycerine.

The mountain traps were well charged with dust. But the inorganic, or road dust predominated. There were also motes of woody fibres, and it was interesting to notice, so nicely were the cells separated, that the kind of wood, namely, the conifera, was at once apparent. The exuviæ of vegetation, in delicate flakes, almost like epithelial scales, were there. And even an occasional trait of some insect structure appeared. All, however, was absolutely invisible to the unaided eye. But the game sought, namely pollen, was truly rare. Doubtless the season was exceptional, such was the frequency of rain. My particular quest was pollen, and only on two traps in fifty did I find any. One yielded five

grains of *aster* pollen, and another three grains of *spiræa*. This paucity of pollen was a genuine surprise.

The study of the home slides afforded an astonishing contrast. A single trap gave me over 200 pollen grains of ragweed, or Roman wormwood, probably the very worst irritant of *æstivis*. Then there was hardly a slide without pollen of some kind. Time will not allow for technical descriptions, but there were pollens also of other plants, though the ragweed dominated largely over all. There was mineral dust, too, in great quantity, woody matter, and considerable débris of an artificial sort, such as fibres of woollen and cotton goods, peculiar to populous places. Scales of insects, great quantities of very fine vegetable exuviæ that I have likened to epithelial scales, were present in profusion. But, to my surprise, the traps showed a considerable amount of fungus spores, rather pretty, but decidedly unlovable objects when once inside the air-passages. They were the spores of smut and bent and mould. Some were in the form of tiny barrels, others like pods, and others in granules. But the list is too long to enumerate. As worthy of having their forms preserved for the engraver, nearly two hundred figures were drawn, simply the selection from the catch of seven traps in about one hundred. I did not detect one microbe, though my observations were subjected to some disadvantages which could admit of their escaping detection.

In my judgment, of the ingredients which make up the air-dust, pollen, especially that of the ragweed, is the worst for the sufferer from hay-fever. A statement of the way in which this one ingredient of the air-dust produces torment shall close this inadequate sketch of the hygiene of the atmosphere.

It is easy to understand that for the subject of asthma, or any allied catarrhal affection, to inhale dust is to beget a painful sense of suffocation, and where hay-fever is accompanied with asthma, alarming spasms are thus excited. But this is especially so if in that dust the pollen of flowers is present; for, particularly if the grains be burred or spiny, the effect is to lacerate or scour the supersensitive mucous area. Then, too, in this state of hyperæsthesia, the walls of the air-passages give out an excessive secretion of a hot acrid fluid. This will make a quasi-decoction of the pungent, perhaps poisonous, essential principle of the pollen grain, as in the ragweed.

But the pollen of a flower is set for the performance of a func-

tion, exacting of it an individual and peculiar activity, which is displayed in a bit of automatism looking wonderfully like instinct. The style of a flower is composed in part of a loose, or more or less spongy, tissue, while the stigma at the top is charged with a saccharine, sticky mucilage. A pollen grain, borne by the wind or by an insect, usually falls on the stigma, and is anchored to it by the spines sticking into the gum. The moisture causes the grain to swell. There is a protrusion of the membrane at one or more of the thin places at the surface, whence a tube, or root-like process, emerges and penetrates the stigma. It seems to be an extension in a tubular form of the membrane, and is filled with the protoplasm of the cell. Having pierced the outer coat of the stigma, this tubule, by a sort of growth, keeps on lengthening and pushing its way down through the loose tissue of the style until it has reached the ovule at the base when fertilization takes place, and the future seed of that flower is assured.

This is the mysterious activity of the life-force in a pollen grain. And, curiously, this tiny vital automaton can be deceived; hence occurs the exercise of a pseudo-instinct. If one of these pollen grains be put on a drop of sweetened water, it will at once protrude its tubule. What then should hinder this spiny little thing, when its grapnels have taken hold of the mucus-covered membrane of the respiratory passage, from protruding its tubule and actually piercing the warm sensitive wall?

Let us now tabulate these four possible modes of action for the pollen of the air dust in hay-fever.

1. Its suffocating effect simply as an impurity of the atmosphere, thus exciting asthma.

2. As a mechanical irritant, begetting inflammation, even to excoriation of the mucous membrane.

3. As a toxic agent, poisoning the tissues.

4. As a pseudo-parasite, penetrating the soft and sensitive parts.

It should be repeated that these activities are here supposed to operate upon the system while in an abnormal state. In a word, behind all there is a hay-fever neurosis. The nasal ducts are the first to show suffering, the malady extending thence to all the respiratory organs and from these to other parts.

How often has the influenza, "la grippe," in the recent epidemic been the fatal prelude to pneumonia! Now Friedlander's

pneumonia coccus, or germ, is known. But have we captured the microbe of this influenza, or catarrhal fever? True there are noteworthy intimations, but we must wait for the demonstration. Professor Weichselbaum, and the physicians, Adolph Jolles and Maximilian, of Vienna, announce the discovery of the influenza microbe. They say it is "cassock shaped, and of a dark blue color," with some resemblance to Friedlander's. What now, if this Vienna find should prove to be the progenitor of the pneumonia microbe, and in some way not unrelated to the change of fungus which we have instanced.

But why should our surmise stop here? The meteorological conditions have been unusual for a year or more; the temperature low in summer and high in winter, with excessive moisture —and late in the fall diseases of our domestic animals, the bovine fever, for instance, and this so closely preceding the catarrhal fever, or influenza epidemic. Hippocrates said, he was told by those who were best acquainted with horses, that they were subject to every ill that afflicts man. What, if in this case, and in this catarrhal fever, or "la grippe," it should prove, as in the fungus cited, that there is an important relation in this respect between man and beast—a lineage of the microbes not unlike that of the fungus propagating by alternations of its host?

And what an efficient cosmic carrier is our atmosphere. Literally on "the wings of the wind" in a score of days or less the compass of the earth may be made. We all remember the terrific eruption of Krakatoa. Even after the filtration of many months the atmosphere was still adulterated with the impalpable material mist of the so-called vocanic dust—so that, the whole world over, every horizon at sunset was colored with a lurid glow.

The knowledge of the air we breathe, its physical character, the air-dust, its invisible inhabitants, the microbes, their potencies for good or ill—all such should beget a practical wisdom in the sufferer, even though he may be a non-professional; for intelligently obedient to the laws which he understands, and limiting physic to the concoction of simples, he may for himself and others, like the good vicar, be a wise dispenser, though without a dispensation.

SAMUEL LOCKWOOD.

"LONDON SOCIETY" AND ITS CRITICS.

BY LADY JEUNE.

It was from no other desire than to give what I still venture to think is a true account of some of the aspects of the most powerful section of Society in London that the paper which I contributed to The North American Review for May, 1892, was written, and after having run the gauntlet of varied and somewhat keen criticism I do not feel that in any important point that account has been refuted. In matters of opinion I may have been wrong, but as regards facts, I think my position has not been shaken. I do not wish to take part in any prolonged controversy. But there are one or two points which may be noticed, and, with the greatest diffidence, and only in deference to a widely expressed hope that some objections should be answered, I venture again to say a few words on the subject.

That I should be supposed to have selected the American public as the father confessor of English sins has excited the feelings of some of my critics somewhat unnecessarily, for no people are so intimate with our faults and shortcomings as our transatlantic cousins. Lady Frances Balfour piles up a terrible indictment on this score, but she need not make herself unhappy by imagining that for the first time the veil of our transgressions has been uplifted for the edification of the younger branch of the great English-speaking family. The Americans know far more about us than we know of ourselves, and there is no scandal, however small, however visionary, that the American reporter has not sniffed from afar, and retailed for the benefit of his *clientèle*.

London has now become to Americans what Paris was, and they cannot come here in their thousands, going into Society, welcomed and fêted as they are, with many relations and friends

married and settled in England, without being as fully alive to our vices and virtues as we are ourselves. There is a set into which they do not go, in whose very existence they hardly believe, and to which little of what I have written applies, but they probably draw their conclusions from what they see of the set in which it is the successful ambition of many of them to move; and, if I have pointed out the characteristics of that set, I have not, I suspect, done more than enable many Americans to verify what their own observation, or the information of their friends, has already suggested. Indeed, I will admit that one of my reasons for addressing American, rather than English, readers, was to tell them, what, I hope, is thought by not a few in England of that special part of Society, which perhaps appears to them the most admirable, as it certainly is the most conspicuous. If it is the ideal of any of them, let it at any rate be said that there are Englishmen and Englishwomen who are not blind to its faults, and let them not imagine that, if they achieve admission to that glittering circle, they are initiated into all the best life of England.

It is impossible, after what Lady Frances Balfour has said, to refrain from some reference to the influence exercised on Society by the Queen. No English man or woman, whatever his or her political opinions, could hesitate a moment in paying the tribute that is due to a sovereign whose whole life has been devoted to the welfare of her people, and whose example has been one of the purest and noblest in the history of the world; and the contrast between the court of Queen Victoria and that of her predecessors is one of the most striking in English history. The coarseness and dulness of the reigns of the early Georges, culminating in the immorality of that of George IV., were the closing pages of a story that one can dwell on with little satisfaction; and the accession of a Queen who had led the simple, uneventful life of the English girl of those days gave promises which have been more than fulfilled.

The cultivated, though somewhat cold nature of the Prince Consort acted as the best safeguard and support to the warm-hearted, impulsive and generous girl-Queen, and, through the too short wedded life of the two, the Court of England presented as high an ideal of purity of life and highminded purpose as could well be imagined. The blow which struck the country when the

Prince died, and which crushed the stricken wife to the ground, will never be forgotten. During the long years of her mourning and seclusion the love and sympathy of the country have gone out to the Queen in no uncertain voice, and her people have never overlooked or forgotten the fact that, however irksome and at whatever cost to herself, the work of the country and its welfare has never been neglected for a moment, and that, in business and state matters, the Queen has been as vigilant and hard-worked as any of her ministers. The Queen's influence to-day is in many ways greater than during any period of her reign, but not in the same direction. The example of fifty-four years of devotion to her people's welfare has deepened and intensified the hold she has always maintained over their affections, and no one who was fortunate enough to witness the grand procession on her Jubilee day can doubt how deep and lasting is the sentiment of loyalty to the Queen. This feeling is shared in common by noble and peasant, but surely no one can deny that the restraining influence that her presence exercised over Society has practically disappeared.

It is true that in one important particular the power of the Sovereign is as great as ever, namely, in giving her sanction to the formal admittance of persons into Society by allowing them presentation at Court. The exercise of such power, and its jealous retention, is a real safeguard to society, and while administered as it now is, constitutes a tribunal of honor which satisfies every one as to its impartiality and probity. Save, however, in this particular, the individual influence of the Sovereign over Society and its leaders cannot seriously be said to exist to any appreciable extent as a restraining power, and even the criterion of presentation has, in point of exclusiveness, ceased to be critical.

One important change that has taken place is the very large increase in the number of those wishing to be presented, which has more than doubled in the last thirty years. It is well known that the Queen's simple tastes and ways of life always made great state functions less acceptable to her than more homely occupations and amusements; and had she continued to hold Drawing Rooms, it is probable that some attempt would have been made to limit the number of those admitted. Now no restriction exists except of the most elastic character, and if a person is not palpa-

bly objectionable in reputation there is no reason against his being presented at Court. The relaxation of this one rule is sufficient to account for the presence of a very large number of people now in London Society who could not have entered it at all thirty years ago.

The Queen is kept well-informed of the events of the great world, and is said to have a very accurate knowledge of what occurs, but there it ends, and however much she may wish to express her approval or dissatisfaction, she cannot do so in the unmistakable yet quiet manner in which she could signify her opinion of persons and things if she were constantly brought into actual contact with them. None of the pageantry and pomp of the most brilliant court is ever wanting on state occasions in England, but the absence of the Queen and her *entourage* has done more to democratize English society than any of the many causes which have helped to bring about the changes of the last thirty years. The influence of the Queen's private life, while appealing strongly to the country at large, and endearing her to the mass of her people, is much more potent among the masses where the feeling to her is one of deep and chivalrous sentiment, than it is among the various sets of Society who take their cue from others in a more exalted position than themselves, but whom they see and with whom they come in contact occasionally only. It is obvious how little control the Sovereign, as long as she abstains from taking her recognized place in Society, can have over the heterogeneous mass of which it is now composed, and there can be no disloyalty in admitting what must now be indisputable.

While holding a strong opinion on this particular point, one cannot in fairness but admit that it may well be that the sentiment of loyalty and affection to the Queen is in a great measure due to her seclusion from the bustle and strife of public life. It may be that the policy which she has pursued for so many years may be dictated by a sagacious and profound knowledge of her people, who, in her isolation, with its pathetic dignity, see only a sovereign whose life presents an idyllic picture of home and simple pursuits, who, surrounded with all the grandeur and power of a great empire, chooses to work steadily for her people's welfare, never relaxing her thoughtful labors on their behalf.

Mr. Mallock in his article on London Society says that its nucleus still "consists of our old landed families, the most im-

portant of which enjoy 'high titular rank,'" and no doubt this is so. But the nucleus is so small that it is almost submerged by the new elements which it has gathered around it. A large number of the old landed families have suffered so much during the last few years from the effects of agricultural depression and the various financial crises of the same period that, ceasing to direct and control Society as formerly, they have become dependent on the new aristocracy of wealth for their amusements and pleasure. And conscious that competition is impossible, they have shown no want of alacrity in availing themselves of what their new hosts are willing to offer for social recognition.

Mr. Mallock thinks that London, like a university or a public school, is divided into many sets wholly independent of each other. From what I am told I am not quite prepared to assent to his view that a college at least, if not a university, or a public school, does not take its tone from a particular set. But I should have thought it beyond question that in London almost every set, whatever its special cult, looks up to and is influenced by the set led by the acknowledged leaders of Society. In London a large section of Society is interested in knowing who are the friends and intimates, and what are the occupations and pursuits, of the Royal Family, and of the "smartest" (I hope that the *Spectator,* in consideration of the inverted commas, will allow me thus to use the word) people in the "upper ten," and with none is this interest more intense than with the new democracy of wealth, to whose influence Mr. Mallock ascribes the decadence of Society in these days.

The great increase of commercial wealth and the large number of new families it has brought into existence have undoubtedly largely contributed to the changes we are discussing, but not to so great an extent as to make them entirely responsible, for luxury was not unknown among the aristocracy before the rise of the rich middle class, and there are many great families who are even now suffering from the lavish expenditure of their forefathers, in whose day merchant princes were rare. Nothing has been more faithful, I might say more obsequious, than the imitation by the new families of the life and surroundings of the great families they strive to compete with. Who has not watched with amusement the growth of the family tree, the gradual increase of the pictures of ancestors on the walls, or the establishment of the family piper

in an old Scotch castle now tenanted by some Mincing Lane millionaire. The sideboard groaning with gold and silver plate, the tribe of gorgeous footmen resplendent in gold and red liveries, are only a few of the indications in the houses of our new aristocracy of the slavish way in which they have copied and emulated the example of the older aristocracy in whose footsteps it is their delight to follow. The splendor and outward trappings of wealth and rank, which fitted a class rich with the traditions of the aristocracy of England, and which have always been accepted as part of its rôle, are adopted by its imitators just as the jay in the fable took the discarded feathers of the peacock to decorate himself, in the vain hope of being mistaken for the princely bird which had lost them.

Where there was position and wealth, there was always luxury, and, where it has survived the shock of agricultural and other financial depression, it exists still among the bluest blood in England, and is not the monopoly of the *nouveaux riches* or of the "strangers within our gates." It is the fashion to talk of the democratic tendencies of this century as quite a novel event in English history. The democratization of Society in England is now more rapid than hitherto, but it should never be forgotten that it is a characteristic of the English aristocracy, as distinguished from that of France, Austria, Spain, and Russia, and, to a less extent of Italy, that it has rested on other foundations than those solely of territorial possessions.

The names of a large number of the English nobility recall those of men who in law or in commerce laid the foundations of families which are now among the oldest and most dignified in England, and, unlike those countries to which I have referred, we have always recognized and accepted any man of commanding ability, whatever his birth or origin, and as a matter of course have admitted him to all the privileges of the social order to which he had raised himself, and to the most perfect equality and intimacy. The aristocracy of the bar, of commerce, and of the sword, has become so welded with our territorial aristocracy that but for the names we cease to remember from whence they came, knowing that by high character, integrity and great ability they fairly won their elevation; and many names of which Englishmen are proudest are those which testify that there is no position so high and honorable that an Englishman of character and talent

may not attain to it, whatever his origin. But we have been also jealous and careful that none but the most worthy should receive the honors and social recognition to which their personal qualities entitle them, and that feeling, though not acting as a universal barrier, has prevented any great abuse of the privilege, except perhaps in the case of political favors. While the lines, however, were so strongly defined, and while a man was rewarded for his individual merit, the women belonging to him rarely if ever shared his good fortune, except as regards his title, their social recognition never following as a right, and only after many years of patient struggle, if ever, did his family rise to the same social position as its head. To quote only two well-known instances, I should say that neither Lady Peel nor Lady Beaconsfield was ever on the same terms of friendly and easy intimacy with the *grandes dames* of the London world as her husband was with every man of whatever high rank or position.

Now the social recognition of the whole family alters the position, and with a clever, bright wife and plenty of money a man may attain to any position of social success in London. His appearance, his past, his capacity, are all immaterial, supposing he has a better-half who knows how to play her cards properly.

Mr. Mallock maintains that some other qualities besides the "gold that gilds" are absolute necessities to insure social success in London, and goes so far as to say it is unattainable without them. I fear I cannot agree with him. No doubt some members of Society owe their entrance into it to their power to charm or amuse, and the power to charm and amuse implies the possession of qualities of various degrees of merit, but always of some distinction. But the great mass of Society owe few of the triumphs they enjoy to their wit, but much to their wine and food, and many a *cordon bleu* lays his head on his pillow every night with the satisfaction of knowing that his master and mistress would never be where they are but for his genius. Intellect, cultivation, refinement, are still the characteristics of certain sets in London, but the largest and most sought after is that whose aims are pleasure, and whose desires are the gratification of the moment.

Perhaps the aristocracy of England have been wiser in their generation than that of some other countries in receiving the newcomers and profiting by their wealth and their willingness to

pay for some sort of social recognition. There is more worldly wisdom in sharing the pleasures provided for us in a more gorgeous and lavish manner than we could afford and accepting the position boldly, than in shrouding ourselves in the lonely grandeur of a ruined and faded past, surrounded by a poverty, which, however satisfactory to our *amour propre*, must be very unsatisfactory in every other particular. We can easily afford to bestow a pitying admiration on the Faubourg St. Germain in its scornful isolation from fashionable Paris and the life which lives and throbs around it, but we are far too philosophical to take that view of life ourselves, and thankfully accept the good things the "gods provide us," feeling with shrewd common sense that life need not be wasted in vain regrets after a lost position which is now only a memory.

We are cynically logical also, for we accept the whole situation; and the few restraining barriers which regulated who could be known and where we would go, have long ago been swept away, and now we go everywhere, Nothing could afford a more edifying sermon on my text than to cast one's memory back in a large, crowded drawing-room in London, and try to trace step by step the social victory which has crowned the persevering efforts of more than half the people in it to storm the citadel of Society; to recall the many rebuffs, the cold suspicions, and in many cases the insults and affronts heaped on them by those with whom they strove to be intimate. The reflections can hardly be pleasant to either side, but there can be little doubt as to which side has the advantage.

Mr. Osborne Morgan is very chivalrous in his defence of society, especially of the girl of the nineteenth century, whom he thinks a creature vastly improved by the emancipation of her life and education. He hardly does more than skim the surface in his criticism of my conclusions upon other subjects I touch upon. I can assure him, however, that if I am wrong, my deductions are the result of my own observation and not of any conjugal confidences. I do not for a moment wish to deny that the girl of the present day has a charm and an individuality very attractive in their way, but she is not an ideal English girl, nor do I think, judging from many of the homes that one knows, that the further development of her character in the same direction is desirable, or that the girls of to-day will make as good wives and mothers

as their mothers were. Formerly the early married years of an Englishwoman's life were devoted to the cares and duties of maternity and of the household; her companions were her children, and she lived with them from the time they were old enough to lisp her name till they left her for homes of their own. The modern fashionable mother relegates those duties to a governess and nurses, and rids herself, as quickly as may be, of the responsibilities of bearing and of bringing her children up, so that she may participate in the gaiety and freedom which begin in a woman's life in England as soon as she marries. If higher education and mental development had made our Englishwomen what is represented by a very small number only of them, one would thankfully acknowledge the advantage of a system which has placed them all on a higher mental and social level than their ancestors. But the high type of girlhood which Mr. Osborne Morgan and Lady Frances Balfour evidently have in their mind is a rare development, and, indeed, I strongly suspect that my chief difference with them lies in the fact that they are fixing their eyes on one class, and I mine on another.

The set of which I wrote would have no influence outside its own small boundaries if it were not that the leaders of Society patronize it, and thus give it an importance and influence otherwise unattainable. There are other sets in English Society as highly born, more richly cultured, more difficult to enter, but these require some personal charm or gift from those who wish to belong to it. Each member contributes a quota of wit, intellect, beauty, or charm, which in itself constitutes a right to be admitted to the *camaraderie* and intimacy of its *milieu*. Lady Frances Balfour well describes it when she says that "ease and intimacy are the distinguishing marks of the social life of its members, and neither the wealth nor the rank of one's circle is of importance so long as he possesses these gifts; though those who have beauty and wealth to offer can never be of it; and though the portal is open to all, only such as are fitted by these qualities become members of the set, with all that is best and most agreeable in its inner life." But I venture to ask Lady Frances Balfour of what set is she thinking when she thus writes. Is it that in which the leading members read of their balls and concerts in the *Evening Post*, of their dresses and personal charms, described as the attractions of London and Sandown? I cannot well

resort to the last weapon of the speaker and "name" names or I think I could illustrate my meaning very abundantly.

About the weaknesses and foibles of society one may laugh and make a jest, but it is from its increasing luxury and love of pleasure that the grave marks of its decadence spring which we cannot perforce ignore. The relaxation of some of the most wholesome rules for its guidance and control are bringing about many serious changes of which at this moment we can hardly guess the danger. I will now venture to notice only two. One, and probably the most dangerous, is the obvious way in which women are losing their control over Society, and with it the respect due to their position from men. The tone of conversation, the stories told in their presence, and the want of deference to them in the behavior of men, are very significant changes. The other I intended to make one of the main points of my former article, and I refer to it again in order to remark that I have not seen any substantial contradiction of it. I mean what I cannot help describing as the mercenary character attaching in an increasing degree to relations otherwise deplorable enough.

I have now said my say. I have not the slightest wish to assume the functions of a censor, or to play the part of a Cassandra. But after all the communications I have received about my article and all I have seen written about it, I cannot help thinking that those best qualified to judge of the matter do not think I was very far from the mark. Perhaps even the unexpected interest my paper excited is a witness to the same thing—*ce n'est que la vérité qui pique.* If so, I can only hope that in the conflict between right and wrong, in which, in our country, the right is never, I believe, permanently or greatly overweighed, my poor words may contribute something to turn the scale.

M. JEUNE.

THE FRENCH ELECTORAL SYSTEM.

I.—A FRENCHMAN'S VIEW.

BY M. ALFRED NAQUET, OF THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

COMMITTEES (*comités*) no longer exert their old influence in French politics. They are now little else than groups of friends who act as sponsors to the public for the candidates, and it often happens that the latter give importance to the former, instead of the reverse. Custom seems to require that a man should not, by his own act, ask for the suffrages of his fellow citizens; so the would-be deputy screens himself behind a small body of supporters who appear on all public occasions as his patrons. They countersign his printed circulars and are conspicuous at his meetings by their presence, but by little else, for it is rare that any of these committee-men can make a speech.

When deputies were chosen by general ticket (*scrutin de liste*), that is, when all the deputies allotted to a Department were voted for by all the electors of the Department, then these committees had a little more weight, for they aided materially in bringing about that necessary accord among aspirants for nomination, in eliminating compromising candidates, and, in a word, in drawing up a strong ticket. At that time it was the custom for the different parties to hold in each township what are called in America primaries, where were chosen delegates, who assembled at the capital of the Department—you would call this a State convention—and, after listening to speeches from the candidates for nomination, determined on the ticket.

But it did not follow that the decision of these conventions was always respected. "Bolting" and "knifing" were not uncommon. The truth is out, people do not like "suffrage at two degrees." Universal suffrage prefers to designate the candidates as well as elect them (and how it accomplishes this will be

shown in a moment). The convention system renders the first *desideratum* impossible. Nor are the primary meetings free from this same objection ; for, however large they may be, they can, at the most, embrace only a minority of the voters. And, furthermore, the system of primaries was not general. Again, in many instances, the delegates to the convention were self-appointed. Thus, it came to pass that, instead of the candidates being chosen by the masses, they were put forward by a clique of politicians who had usurped the rights of the people. There are instances, consequently, of individuals whose candidature was set aside by the conventions appearing in the field "on their own hook," and coming in at the head of the poll.

Still another circumstance tended to check the acclimation in France of the convention system.

According to the election law of 1849, a single* polling was sufficient to secure a choice, except in the very rare case where no one of the candidates had secured an eighth of the ballots of the registered voters. With this exception, the candidate who had the highest number of votes, even if this number was inferior to the united strength of his various opponents, was declared elected. In a word, it was not necessary then as it is to-day to obtain at the first polling, in order to win, at least half plus one of the votes cast, or, as we say in France, an absolute majority ; consequently, under the old law each party dared put only one ticket in the field, for if it divided on two, it ran the risk, although it might really have on its side a majority of the voters of the district, of letting some of its opponents get in. If this feature of the law of 1849 had been retained, it is highly probable that this necessity for union would have given new strength to the convention system and there would have gradually developed in France a party organization analogous to that which exists in the United States.

But this part of the old law was stricken out in the new one, and to-day, whether the election be by *scrutin de liste* or by *scrutin u uinominal*—that is, each district electing one candidate, as in America—the first polling produces no result unless somebody has secured the ballots of at least one-quarter of the registered voters, and also at least half plus one of the ballots actually cast. If this

*According to the present electoral law a second polling occurs a fortnight after the first in certain cases, explained further on in this article.—ED. NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

majority has not been obtained by some one of the candidates another polling must be held a fortnight later, when a simple majority of the ballots cast suffices for a choice. The consequence of this system is that universal suffrage itself, acting directly, assumes the duties of the delegated convention and decides who shall be the candidates for the final and decisive polling. On the first election day, therefore, votes may be scattered without risk, for if there were to be as many candidates as there are voters the ballots of one party would all be added together for the defeat of the common enemy. Two weeks later each party rallies around the candidate who obtained the largest number of votes at the first polling, or, if the election is by *scrutin de liste*, the ticket is made up from those names which stood highest. Now there must be no "getting out of the party traces." But party discipline is acquiesced in with all the more readiness because it is universal suffrage which has settled upon the candidates and not a handful of schemers in convention assembled.

There is still another reason why the power of committees and conventions is weakened by *scrutin uninominal*. As the candidate may now confine his attention to a district very much smaller than the whole Department, which has to be covered in the case of *scrutin de liste*, he is able to make a thorough canvass and put himself in direct communication with all his constituents. He is master of his own acts, and is not hampered by fellow candidates, as is the case in the *scrutin de liste* system. So if he is a man of ability, activity and energy, a committee is of little consequence, as far as he is concerned. He goes from man to man, from town to town, and takes part, as often as possible, in those joint debates which are as common in a political campaign in France as they are now rare in America.

Public meetings are one of the most effective instruments in a canvass, and the candidate who can "think on his feet" has a great superiority over a less fortunate rival. Another aid is the press. Candidates blessed with a long purse scatter broadcast newspapers favorable to their canvass, and in case these are lacking, circulars are showered on the district. In the big cities handbills play an important part. Notwithstanding the law, which forbids it, each candidate hides his rival's bills under his own, to the profit of stationers and printers, and to the amusement of street loafers.

In January, 1889, during the famous Boulanger–Jacques contest at Paris (M. Jacques, defeated at this time, has since been elected to the Chamber), this battle of bill-posters assumed Titanic proportions. I have space to cite but one episode of this serio-comic struggle. In a street near the Bourse two posters were hard at work for their respective candidates, the bills of the one being immediately covered by those of the other. The eighth layer of Jacques manifestoes was rapidly hiding the same number of Boulanger manifestoes, when the General's acolyte had a happy thought. While the rival was busily absorbed in this work a Boulanger bill was deftly stuck on his back, and for the rest of the day he continued his labors amidst shouts of laughter, echoed in the evening papers till the incident went the rounds of Paris.

In a competition of this kind the richest candidate comes out ahead, of course. But while one cannot wholly abandon this custom, one must admit that it has only little effect on the result of the election. The newspapers and public meetings are the powerful agencies.

A French political gathering differs materially from an American one. In the first place it is the rule in France for the audience to choose the officers of the meeting. Again, the opponents of those who called the meeting are given an equal chance to speak. There are no policemen to keep order. During the early years of the Third Republic our political reunions were relatively calm. After some little tumult over the election of the officers, the speakers managed to be heard. But to-day an execrable habit seems to have taken possession of all parties. Bands of young men disturb systematically the meetings of their opponents and drown the voices of the speakers, until things have come to such a pass that one can obtain order only through the efforts of an organized body of supporters. The maintenance of this temporary police force increases considerably the expenses of an election.

The cost of an election varies in different places, and there is a tendency towards its increment. At the beginning of the present republic candidates were generally surrounded by devoted supporters who lent halls, stuck bills, and distributed ballots without pay. But now love for the cause has given way before desire for private gain, and candidates have to pay for everything, even for the good-will of the press.

When in February, 1871, I ran for the Chamber of Deputies

for the first time, my election expenses footed up 500 francs. My second election, which occurred six months later, I having resigned my seat for certain reasons, cost me 800 francs. In 1876 a double candidature with two pollings in one case required 3,200 francs. In 1877 I spent 1,000 francs, and the following year 1,200 francs. To-day a canvass in any of the Vaucluse districts, where I used to run, eats up a round 10,000 francs. In 1873, 40,000 francs was spent on the election of Barodet in Paris. General Boulanger and his opponent in the fight of January, 1889, together paid out over a million francs.

This increasing burden of election expenses is the more to be regretted because, on account of the absence of party organization, the weight all falls on the candidates. Unless some remedy is found for this state of things it will hand over the Chamber of Deputies to a plutocracy. Sometimes, however, the evil is removed by the parties getting together a campaign fund. Thus, in 1889, the Conservatives distributed among their candidates five million francs, due to the generosity of an arch-millionaire, whose name I am not free to mention. During his three years' struggle, General Boulanger spent a like sum, the origin of which was unknown at the time—this is not the case to-day—even to his own committee.* The Government, too, whose secret service fund was not equal to the occasion, had recourse to friendly private capital in order to be in a financial condition to cope with its foes.

Such is the electoral system of France. Much more might be said, perhaps, in order to complete this sketch. But the limits of this article force me to keep within bounds. I think, however, that I have written enough to give the grand Democracy on the other side of the Atlantic a sufficiently clear idea of the methods of universal suffrage here, and of the way in which its working in France differs from the practices to which Americans are accustomed.

ALFRED NAQUET.

II.—AN AMERICAN'S VIEW.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

IN THE preceding article my friend M. Naquet has, according

*M. Naquet was the most prominent member of this committee.—ED. NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

to his habit, treated his subject in an excessively clear and entertaining manner. But I will not obtrude, perhaps, being an American, if I attempt to supplement his excellent paper by presenting a few considerations treated from an American standpoint.

What first strikes an American when examining French election methods is the almost total absence of any "machine," at least of our own type. There does exist a pretty powerful government control, about which a word will be said further on in this paper. But French party management is of such a simple nature that, taken as a whole, it may be safely said that there is no effective organization. And what there is of it is confined chiefly to the "outs." This state of things is all the more remarkable from the fact that the French have a rare genius for organization.

This lack of party organization is due to several causes. The form of government has been changed so often during the past century that political organism has not had time to develop. Then again, the various parties that exist to-day have been so broken up into factions since 1870 that individual rather than united action was the natural outcome of the situation. For several years Gambetta was an all powerful "boss," though there was no real party machinery behind him. This lacuna is filled, however, in a large measure, at least for Republicans, by the part played by the Central government in elections. This peculiar and influential participation, which differs very largely from our American methods, now calls for a word of notice.

Louis XIV. declared that he was the State. To-day it may be said, with equal truth, that the cabinet is the State. This is especially so in home affairs, and particularly so of the Minister of the Interior, who probably exercises greater power within the boundaries of France than does the President of the United States throughout the Union. The Prefects, or Governors, of the eighty-six Departments into which the territory of France is divided, are appointed by the Minister of the Interior, and are always under his direct orders; and as these Prefects have the last word in all the administrative affairs of the Departments, and enjoy the veto power over the acts of the departmental legislatures and the various town councils, the excessively tight grip which the Minister of the Interior has on the nation becomes strikingly evident. In Paris, furthermore, the whole police force is at his beck, and his colleagues of the war and navy offices are always ready

to lend him a helping hand if circumstances require it. Nor, when necessary, does this modern Great Elector hesitate to use, and to use freely, these tremendous powers. At the end of a hotly contested campaign more than one prefect has been dismissed because "he failed to carry the election." If Boulanger and Boulangerism were nipped in the bud, it was because M. Constans, who, by nature and habit, was not overscrupulous, was armed with strong weapons, which enabled him to strike quickly and mortally. It may be said, therefore, that in things political the French Minister of the Interior is an arch-boss, before whom our local, State and National bosses sink into utter insignificance.

One of the minor causes—in some instances, as during the struggle of 1889, one of the chief causes—of the power exerted by the Minister of the Interior in election matters is the secret service fund, which is used to influence the newspapers and to aid impecunious but servile candidates. In the United States a mint of money is spent in a Presidential campaign; but it is subscribed in a more or less voluntary manner by private individuals, and is dispensed by the national committees of the respective parties. It is not taken from the Federal treasury and placed where it will do the most good by a member of the cabinet. In France, however, the party in power makes little if any effort as a party to raise a fund of its own. It looks to the Minister of the Interior to provide the sinews of war. When, as in 1885 under the Brisson cabinet, this side of the campaign is neglected, "the powers that be" see their majority in the Chamber woefully reduced; while when the government, as in 1889, aided by the funds of the *haute finance*, as it is believed, is lavish with money, then it easily carries the day.

Thus it happens that in France the whole people is taxed to pay a portion of the election expenses of one of the political parties, and as only out-and-out supporters of the cabinet in power are likely to obtain any of this pap, it happens that a minority of the nation has a part of its election bills paid by the whole nation. Public men have become so accustomed to this method that even the most honorable aspirant for legislative distinction would scarcely hesitate, if his purse were short, to ask for and accept financial aid of this sort, thus practically selling himself morally to the faction which controls the government at the moment of the election.

It is now very difficult for even a Republican, though he be rich, to successfully contest a seat when his candidature is not countenanced by the Minister of the Interior. Ten years ago this was not so true as it is to-day, and even at present perhaps I ought to make an exception in favor of the great cities. A mugwump of this sort has against him not only the anti-Republican voters but even the official Republican world, beginning with the Minister of the Interior, the Prefect, and the whole hierarchy of the officials of the Department, even down to the rural constable or *garde champêtre*. Nor can he expect any aid from the secret service fund. He is safe to be given the cold shoulder by scores of Republican voters who know that if he should be elected they would not have in him "a friend at court," because he would not belong to the government *coterie*. So all those voters who have favors to ask of the government—and the amount of patronage dispersed in France is as large as it is varied—are not inclined to support a candidate who, if elected, will not be able to secure post-office clerkships, tobacco shops, or appointments in the *gendarmerie* for devoted constituents. So these shrewd place-hunters, who may be counted by the hundreds in every district, work tooth and nail for the government candidate by opposing tooth and nail the rival Republican.

This dwarfing influence of the central government is probably the principal reason why a general election is such a tame affair in France when compared with a Presidential campaign in America. Stump speaking on a large scale may be said to be almost unknown. There are no immense mass meetings, no body of able orators hurrying from town to town and addressing large gatherings of men and women, no torch-light processions, little if any "campaign literature." With the exception of the candidates themselves, scarcely a man of prominence opens his mouth on any public rostrum; and these candidates rarely speak outside of their own district. This paucity of public discussion is strikingly shown by the absence in France of halls capable of containing great popular gatherings. Even Paris is without its Cooper Institute, and you would search all France in vain for a Madison Square Garden. Political meetings, such as they are, generally take place in a public school building, in a stuffy dancing hall, in a café, or even in a circus. During the exhibition of 1889 one of the most important general elections which had occurred in

France since that of the autumn of 1877 was in progress. Then it was that Boulanger and Boulangerism were shelved. But this critical contest caused so slight a ripple on the surface that probably not a score of the hundreds of Americans who then visited Paris were aware of the fact that the allied enemies of the republic were then engaged in their last desperate effort to produce a revolution.

Now a final word about the *modus operandi* of the act of voting. Here Americans can find much to admire, and here may be discovered features which we might adopt with benefit.

Speaking broadly, it may be said that, on the whole, honesty is the policy. There is very little "repeating," no "blocks of five," no tissue ballots, scarcely any ballot-box stuffing, no crooked "returning boards." In most cases citizens vote legally and their ballots are counted honestly. Of course I do not mean to say that there are no abuses. A five minutes' talk with any deputy will convince you that the French electorate is not immaculate. But, taking humanity as it is, and considering the difficulties in the way of a "fair count" where universal suffrage is practised, my observations, extending over ten or fifteen years, prove that the act of "taking the sense of the masses" is nowhere practised more purely than in France.

A brief mention of a few of the causes which lead up to this excellent result, and some description of one or two of the best features of the system, may not prove uninteresting.

The two chief safeguards against cheating at the French ballot-box are the poll list and the electoral card.

In order to have your name put on the poll list you must prove beyond doubt your identity and your majority. Here deception is difficult, impossible even, on account of the perfect *état civil* methods which prevail all over France. Every birth is carefully registered by trained officials, and when a male citizen reaches the age of 21 he must produce a properly attested "act of birth," which establishes his identity and age, before the mayor will place the new voter's name on the poll list.

This carefully drawn up poll list is not the only check on fraudulent voting. Every man, as he steps up to the ballot-box, must produce his "electoral card," on which are inscribed his full name, profession and residence. This card is issued by the mayor of the town where the voter lives, after the latter has es-

tablished, as just explained, his identity and majority. Each electoral card is numbered, and when it is presented at the polls, the judge of elections takes it, and calls off the number and name, while two other judges, with the official poll list before them, repeat aloud the number and name and check them off on the register. Then, and not till then, the first judge accepts the ballot from the voter and drops it into the box; and before handing back the card he tears off a corner of it, which renders it useless for further voting that day. These bits of card are strung on a wire and are counted, at the close of the polls, in order to see if they tally with the number of ballots found in the box.*

The sentimental side of French character comes out strongly during election time. Universal suffrage is always personified in France; witness several examples of this in the foregoing article of my friend Naquet. The polling-booth is the town hall, a school-room, a church porch, or the mayor's private house; never a tavern, a bar-room, or a corner liquor-store. The judges sit with uncovered heads, without cigars in their mouth, and every voter removes his hat as he approaches the ballot-box. Thus at least one of the stock arguments against woman suffrage does not exist in France. There is a solemnity and stillness about the act of voting, especially in the smaller cities, which is almost oppressive.

The main reason for this good order at the polls and this minimum of fraud is unquestionably due to the severe way in which the French Criminal Code deals with election offences of every kind. For instance, M. Naquet once had a mayor, who had substituted a false set of ballots for the true ones, condemned to six months' imprisonment. Only a few weeks ago, in July, M. Daniel Wilson, son-in-law of the late President Grévy, was fined a thousand francs because he had engaged too many ticket distributors and had paid them twenty-five francs apiece for their

*An ex-Senator pointed out to me the other day an ingenious way in which "repeating" is accomplished in France in spite of, in fact by the aid of, the electoral card. "In the large cities where people are unacquainted with one another," said my distinguished interlocutor, "there is no hesitation in voting for the dead, bankrupts and the disqualified, whose names were left on the list at the last revision. Furthermore," continued my informant, "in many parts of France, especially in Corsica and the south, at Toulouse above all, material frauds are committed by substituting other ballots for those found in the boxes. There are a thousand tricks resorted to in order to produce results of this kind. It is only fair to say, however, that this abuse is practised in a general and important way only in very critical elections, such as those of 1887 and 1888. In such cases the opposition in order to win must have at least a quarter more than the majority. If the majority is less than that the returns are cooked in favor of the opposing candidate. When you see a government candidate elected by two or three majority, you may be perfectly sure that he has stolen his seat."

work on election day. An election was once annulled because a candidate had given, a short time before the day of voting, six thousand francs for the restoration of the town hall. The would-be deputy lost both his seat and his money. On another occasion a result was declared null because a canal, in whose construction the candidate took a deep interest, was inaugurated a few days before the election on land that had not yet been bought, and before the contracts for the work had been signed. A similar ruling was observed by the courts in a case where a mayor announced on the eve of the ballot that an appropriation obtained by the efforts of the candidate was to be immediately spent in improving the roads of the township; and again, where a candidate promised, if he came in at the head of the poll, to give money to certain rifle and fire companies. Treating is even sufficient ground for rendering void an election if the aim and the effect were to influence the result.

The penalties inflicted on those guility of electoral misdemeanors are prompt and heavy. Causing disorder at the polls is a serious offence. Tampering with a ballot may entail imprisonment for a period of from one to five years, accompanied by a fine of from five hundred to five thousand francs. A like fine and imprisonment would be inflicted upon a person who, requested to write out a ballot for another party, should place on it other names than those indicated. Voting by means of false registration or by making use of the electoral card of another citizen is punished by six months' to two years' imprisonment and a fine of from two hundred to two thousand francs. "Repeating" calls down upon the offender a similar condemnation. The person who receives or offers a bribe may spend from three months to two years in prison, and suffer a loss of from five hundred to five thousand francs in money. When it is remembered that "Jersey justice" is meted out in France, the efficacy of such sentences in checking fraud at the polls will be fully realized.

THEODORE STANTON.

PARAMOUNT QUESTIONS OF THE CAMPAIGN.

BY THE HON. SYLVESTER PENNOYER, GOVERNOR OF OREGON.

THE old adage that "man proposes, but God disposes" has had somewhat of an exemplification in the shaping of the issues most prominent in the present quadrennial Presidential campaign. Until lately the great body of the American people has been about equally divided between two great political parties, and it has been the wish and purpose of the leaders of both of these parties that the tariff question should be the great question at issue during the pending canvass. Of course, from one point of view, the desire was most natural. The leading statesmen on both sides had stock in trade already furnished which would save further trouble in the preparation of speeches for the stump. On the one side they had facts, figures, and arguments to conclusively prove that a protective tariff ultimately resulted in lower prices for everything except wool. On the other side they had as conclusive facts, figures, and arguments to prove that a protective tariff raised the price of everything on which it was placed except wool, which would bear a better price if the tariff on it was removed. The discussion as marked out by the "defenders of home industry" and the "tariff reformers" all gravitated around the great American sheep, which animal has in reality been the fruitful theme of more argument in Congress and out of Congress than all the other animals let out of Noah's ark combined, a fact which somewhat justifies the profane imprecation said to have been visited upon its innocent head by the distinguished John Randolph, of Roanoke.

About nine months ago the Pacific slope was visited by a peregrinating band of Democratic statesmen, including one United States Senator and two prominent members of the lower House of Congress, who, after the fashion of the early Apostles, went forth into the wilderness to enlighten the heathen, but who, unlike them, did not preach any new gospel. No man of ordinary com-

mon sense will for one moment assert that there are no evils connected with the administration of the federal government except those connected with the tariff, and yet the tariff was the sole burden of the theme of these wandering minstrels. It was all tariff, from Spokane to San Francisco, and the whole concert was on harps, all the strings of which were of wool.

To any one who will for one moment sit down and calmly reflect, there is furnished by the grave discussions on the tariff, which have almost exclusively engaged the attention of statesmen in Congress and of the press and rostrum outside of Congress, a fruitful theme for both satire and sarcasm. What prodigious volumes of speeches have been made as to the mode and manner of tariff taxation, as to what articles should be taxed and what articles should not be taxed, and as to the degree of taxation that each and every article so taxed should bear, while there have never been, as there ought to have been, any speeches made against the system itself. When we remember that it was opposition to the navigation laws of Great Britain, which were protective tariff laws compelling the people of the colonies to buy their manufactured articles within the British dominions, that caused our free-trading forefathers to rebel; and when we remember that the first tariff law was enacted because "direct taxes are not so easily laid on the scantily settled inhabitants of our wide-extended country;" and that it was the purpose of our early statesmen "when we are out of debt to leave our trade free," as stated by Benjamin Franklin in a letter written in 1788; and when we further remember that taxation by tariff is a most unjust system, being to a certain degree a *per capita* tax through which the poor are compelled to bear an undue proportion of the government burden; and that the statesmen of neither party have had the courage to denounce the system itself as a whole, but have vented their righteous indignation against its trifling details,—the striking denunciation furnished by Holy Writ happily comes to our relief in the portrayal of such statesmanship, "Ye blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

It was not until a new party entered the political arena, unshackled by the restrictions of former associations and impelled by the inspirations of freedom gathered from the traditions of our revolutionary ancestry, that the warfare on revenue taxation began to become one of principle instead of one of percentage.

The People's party boldly declares for "an income tax." It plants itself upon that impregnable doctrine that the revenues of the government should be raised from the wealth of the nation and not from its industries. There is presented a demand involving a grave principle and founded upon the plainest precepts of right and justice. It was during the reign of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome, that the just change was made from a *per capita* tax to one placed upon individuals according to the measure of wealth. This one act stamped him as a ruler of superior political abilities and as a just and enlightened patriot, and entitled him to the lasting gratitude of the Roman people.

It is to the eternal disgrace of the federal government that while its tariff taxation falls with grievous weight upon the laboring classes, there is no tax whatever upon the wealth of the country. This is probably the only civilized country in all Christendom that thus relieves wealth from sharing the burden of taxation. In our State governments wealth is taxed and the sound theory prevails that a citizen should pay in proportion to the property he owns, but the taxation by the federal government is by impost duty upon articles of general use and consumption, and hence a poor laborer who supports a large family by the labor of his hands, is in reality taxed much more for the support of the government than his rich neighbor worth a million of dollars who is without family. The injustice of such a system of taxation is apparent. A change, however, will soon come.

The great wrong, committed now for long years, of imposing additional taxation upon the labor and industries of the country while wealth is entirely exempted must and will be shortly remedied. Justice demands a change of policy, and as surely as God reigns, so surely will it come. Let wealth be compelled, as it ought, to bear its full share of the public burden, and then an opportunity will be afforded to relieve the labor and industries of our people from the excessive charges imposed upon them by removing all taxation entirely from everything that the laboring classes of the country eat, drink, and wear. The removal of burdensome restrictions upon commerce and the heavy incubus from oppressed industry by limiting tariff taxation to the luxurious alone, would open up before us the brightest page of our country's history.

But important as this question of revenue taxation really is,

there is one other question of far greater importance to the people. The refusal of Congress to coin silver equally with gold, and the adoption of the policy of purchasing by the government a stated quantity of silver bullion, which is stored up as such, and upon which is issued a bastard currency not a legal tender to Shylock, have pushed the question of free coinage ahead of the question of revenue taxation. What is the real issue as to free coinage, which was the settled and well-established policy of the government for more than eighty years from its foundation, and the wisdom of which was never questioned until the great octopus of the national banks surreptitiously procured a change? There is no citizen of this republic that disputes the necessity of paper currency. The necessity for it among all civilized nations is undisputed and indisputable. There is not enough of the precious metal to meet the stern requirements of commercial intercourse, and hence all nations require a paper currency. Conceded that a certain amount of money, gold, silver, and paper, is demanded by the business necessities of a nation, and it then follows that the greater the volume of metal currency the less will be the required amount of paper, and the smaller the amount of metal currency the greater the amount of paper.

If the banks could prevent the coinage of silver currency there would be a greater demand for bank paper, while if there were free coinage the demand for such paper would be diminished. The real opponents of the free coinage of silver are the national banks, and the real issue in regard to it under our present financial system is between metal currency and paper currency—between money issued by the government and money issued by the national banks—between the "solid silver dollar" and "bank rag-money." That is the real issue, and it cannot be gainsaid or denied, and upon that issue it is most difficult to understand how any Democrat in the whole land, in view of the past policy of the government and the traditions of his own party, can hesitate for one single moment as to the side upon which he should stand. Much has been said about there not being a dollar's worth of silver in the standard dollar. It passes at par and hence this assertion is unfounded. It is not alone the particular amount of metal that makes a dollar, for we all remember how some fifteen years ago the trade dollar of 420 grains, not receivable for duties, was at a discount of five and six per cent, while the standard

dollar of 412½ grains although not clothed with the full attributes of money, but receivable for duties, is permanently maintained at par.

The one great issue, however, which transcends all others in importance, relates to the issuance of paper money. The most important questions, whether the government itself shall issue the required paper currency of the nation or delegate such issue to private corporations; whether it shall keep its own surplus, which in a great nation like ours must always amount to millions, in its own sub-treasuries or shall parcel it out among the national banks; and whether such governmental money shall be loaned by it direct to the people, at a low rate of interest upon undoubted security, or be divided among such banks, without interest, to be loaned by them to the people at high rates for their enrichment, will be the paramount issues of the forthcoming Presidential contest.

In this country, as a general rule, the people are braver than their parties and bolder than their leaders. These issues have been forced to the front by the people and not by parties or party leaders. The modern political leader is quite apt to be a moral coward. But it was not always so. These identical issues were once forced upon the people by the bravest leader in American history. Andrew Jackson alone began the warfare upon the old Bank of the United States, which did not cease until the fiscal policy of the government was entirely changed by an utter divorcement of the federal treasury from banking institutions and by the adoption of the sound policy of keeping the government funds in its own sub-treasuries.

It is perhaps not generally remembered that President Jackson not only dictated the policy above mentioned, which was adopted by Congress and indorsed by the people, but that he advocated a further policy which did not receive the support of Congress. In his first message to Congress after expressing his opposition to a renewal of the charter of the Bank of the United States he said: "Under these circumstances, if such an institution is essential to the fiscal operations of the government, I submit to the wisdom of the legislature whether a national one, founded upon the credit of the government and its revenue, might not be devised that would avoid all constitutional difficulties and at the same time secure all the advantages to the government and country that were expected to result from the present bank."

This stone which the builders then rejected will become the heads-tone of the corner of the financial policy of the nation.

And who can tell how vastly different and how much better might have been the condition of the country to-day if that wise suggestion of the Sage of the Hermitage had been adopted. The panics of 1837 and those which have followed might all have been avoided ; the contraction and expansion of currency which have been instrumental in prostrating industries in times of peace and plenty, throwing honest labor out of employment and bankrupting hundreds of thousands of honest, industrious tradesmen and manufacturers, might have been prevented ; and lastly, and more important than all, the monied oligarchy of the national banks which now controls the finances of the nation, and is virtually absorbing the wealth of the whole people, would never have had an existence. It will be demanded that the government itself shall issue all the currency of the country, that it shall keep it in its own treasury vaults, and that it shall be loaned by it to the people directly, and not through the national banks.

The great paramount issue, therefore, before the country in the pending political struggle is in regard to the character of the paper money to be furnished to the people. On the one side the People's party declares that all money shall be issued by the government direct, and shall be sound money or full legal-tender money. On the other side, the Chicago convention has virtually committed itself to the scheme, brought forth in the banking interests of the country, of restricting legal-tender money to gold alone, hampering the coinage of silver and providing for an unlimited issuance of bank money based upon railroad and municipal securities.

In our whole country's history there has never before been exhibited such a complete change of front upon an important issue by any political party as that furnished by the convention at Chicago. Ignoring the most sacred traditions of the party, and wheeling its well-drilled columns to the right-about-face, it places itself in alignment with the great banking interests of the country. It would not indeed require any great stretch of imagination to believe that the bones of Old Hickory turned uneasily in his grave when the party thus proved false to his teachings and false to its whole past record.

SYLVESTER PENNOYER.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST THE CHOLERA.

BY SURGEON-GENERAL WALTER WYMAN; PRESIDENT CHARLES G. WILSON, OF THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF HEALTH; DR. SAMUEL W. ABBOTT, SECRETARY BOARD OF HEALTH, BOSTON, MASS.; AND DR. CYRUS EDSON, SANITARY SUPERINTENDENT HEALTH DEPARTMENT, CITY OF NEW YORK.

SURGEON-GENERAL WYMAN:

CHOLERA is a greater respecter of persons than is yellow fever. "Yellow Jack" claims alike the aristocrat and the peasant for its victims, but the cholera seeks by natural choice denizens of unsanitary situations; in other words, it flourishes in filth. Those with clean environments and simple precautions looking to avoidance of close proximity or contact with infected persons or materials may feel reasonably assured of safety.

Cholera has been here before. The United States has experienced epidemics in 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1848, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1866, 1873 (brought by immigrants from Hamburg); our last relations with it being in 1887, when the "Alesia" and the "Britannia" discharged 22 cases at the New York quarantine, brought hither from Naples.

It will not be necessary to rehearse the history of these previous experiences except to say that they all originated in the cholera nests of Europe and Asia. Nor will it be necessary to enter into a history of the existence of cholera within the memory of man, and its marches from its habitat in India over the commercial world. The text of the present article limits my consideration to the safeguards which we are able to employ against cholera in general and this epidemic in particular.

The first safeguard against the introduction of cholera from without is to construct a sanitary cordon around our coasts and along our borders. The maritime quarantine of this country is at the present time in a condition of divided responsibility, which

arises largely from the political relations of the States to the nation, the State assuming police powers within its borders, the enactment and enforcement of health laws, and the management of the establishments representing them. All of the Atlantic States (Georgia and Virginia excepted) have State Boards of Health, and in each of these States there is provision for local boards which exist under regulations usually rendering their action harmonious with that of the State Boards. The right of Congress to establish a controlling maritime national quarantine lies in its constitutional power to regulate commerce and enact laws for the public welfare. But this right at present lies dormant and the other theory is allowed to prevail, viz., that quarantine is a police function belonging to the State. This may be seen by perusal of the following act approved April 29, 1878 :

That no vessel or vehicle coming from any foreign port or country where any contagious or infectious disease may exist, and no vessel or vehicle conveying any person or persons, merchandise or animals, affected with any infectious or contagious disease, shall enter any port of the United States or pass the boundary line between the United States and any foreign country, contrary to the quarantine laws of any one of said United States, into or through the jurisdiction of which said vessel or vehicle may pass, or to which it is destined, or except in the manner and subject to the regulations to be prescribed as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That whenever any infectious or contagious disease shall appear in any foreign port or country, and whenever any vessel shall leave any infected foreign port, or, having on board goods or passengers coming from any place or district infected with cholera or yellow fever, shall leave any foreign port, bound for any port in the United States, the consular officer, or other representative of the United States at or nearest such foreign port, shall immediately give information thereof to the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine Hospital Service, and shall report to him the name, the date of departure, and the port of destination of such vessel; and shall also make the same report to the health officer of the port of destination in the United States, and the consular officers of the United States shall make weekly reports to him of the sanitary condition of the ports at which they are respectively stationed; and the said Surgeon-General of the Marine Hospital Service shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be charged with the execution of the provisions of this act, and shall frame all needful rules and regulations for that purpose, which rules and regulations shall be subject to the approval of the President; but such rules and regulations shall not conflict with or impair any sanitary or quarantine laws or regulations of any State or municipal authorities now existing or which may hereafter be enacted.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the medical officers of the Marine-Hospital Service and of customs officers to aid in the enforcement of the national quarantine rules and regulations established under the preceding section.

SEC. 5. That whenever, at any port of the United States, any State or municipal quarantine system may now or may hereafter exist, the officers or agents of such system shall, upon the application of the respective States or municipal authorities, be authorized and empowered to act as officers or agents of the national quarantine system, and shall be clothed with all the powers of United States officers for quarantine purposes, but shall receive no pay or emolument from the United States. At all other ports where, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, it shall be deemed necessary to establish quarantine, the medical officers or other agents of the Marine-Hospital Service shall perform such duties in the enforcement of the quarantine rules and regulations as may be assigned them by the Surgeon-General of that Service under this act: *Provided*, That there shall be no interference in any manner with any quarantine laws or regulations as they now exist or may hereafter be adopted under State laws.

A subsequent act to perfect this law in the matter of providing penalties for trespassing on the quarantine grounds of the United States was approved August 1, 1888.

An interstate quarantine law was approved March 28, 1890, to prevent the spread of contagious diseases from one State to another, but this act affords no ground for action in enforcing a maritime quarantine against foreign nations. Under act of Congress approved August 1, 1888, but in conformity with the law of 1878, the general government established eight National quarantine stations, as follows:

Cape Charles quarantine; Delaware Breakwater quarantine (this one established in 1884); South Atlantic quarantine at Blackbeard Island, Sapello Sound, Ga.; Gulf quarantine at Chandeleur Island, near Biloxi, Miss.; Key West quarantine at Dry Tortugas, Fla.; San Francisco quarantine; San Diego, Cal., quarantine; Port Townsend, Wash., quarantine; which are operated in such a manner as to supplement or aid the local quarantines. Where State or local regulations are insufficient the Surgeon General may make, under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, additional rules which must not interfere with the local laws. The State and local boards of health are managed by sanitarians of special knowledge, whose methods keep in pace with the most advanced views of the sanitary world; but it must be obvious that a maritime quarantine dependent on the action of a dozen States must rest for its complete efficiency upon their united action. Such unity can only be obtained by mutual agreement, without legal constraint to enforce it, and can only be maintained so long as all consent. To relegate the national safety from epidemic

diseases to the police powers of the States is, as Mr. Secretary Foster said in a recent address, "a relic of the doctrine of States' rights." A national maritime quarantine is the only logical safeguard against disease from without, and this topic, so fully discussed by the eminent sanitarian Dr. E. O. Shakespeare in his report upon "Cholera in India and Europe," is summed up in these words which I quote from his valuable work:

"Why then should the direction, expense, and responsibility of a system of common defence against the inroads of foreign disease, any more than against the invasion of foreign foes, be assumed and borne by those municipalities or States which happen to have a maritime location? Why should the vast majority, located inland, be allowed to shift their responsibilities and obligations or be denied a voice in the direction of affairs which so greatly concern them? The protection of the public health by maritime quarantine is a matter which interests not merely a narrow belt of coast; it seriously concerns the whole of the vast territory between our shores." (p. 846).

The law of 1878 was passed with special respect to the extreme views of the States' right doctrine then held with tenacity by many, and it was therefore a compromise measure carried through by the efforts of Senator Isham G. Harris, of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on Epidemic Diseases, in that body.

The question has been recently raised whether in exercising the power to aid local authorities the government has not the power to extend the stringency of these local health laws. The recent proclamation of the President directing a detention of twenty days for all vessels carrying emigrants, having brought doubt to the minds of some local health officers as to their responsibility thereunder, it may be answered by an example: Though the Health Officer of New York may legally require a much shorter detention, the health laws of New York (Sec. I. Chap. 358) *permit* the detention of vessels from infected localities "for at least twenty days after their cargo shall have been discharged," and it will be seen that the Executive order is not repugnant to laws of that commonwealth, but in direct line with it. It is gratifying to observe the public approval passed upon this quarantine circular ordered by the President, and to be informed of the concurring action of the principal sanitary authorities both in this country and Canada, whose aid in its enforcement must be had to render it more efficient.

This system of quarantine differs from the English plan, the situation of the two countries both as to topographical relations

and their commercial interests determining the special provisions employed. England is a "tight little island," smaller than several of our single States, whose relations with the outer world are dependent on her commerce. The United States has a coast line covering several thousand miles, and two borders of equal length, and it is manifest that the same system could not well be applied to both.

England depends for the safety of her national health largely upon internal sanitation. But the value of a quarantine to a metropolis, particularly if characterized by unsanitary conditions, can not be denied. Quarantine is an indefinite term, and the condemnation thereof, resulting from its barbarous practice years ago, should not lead to a feeling of opposition to its modern and scientific usage.

The safeguards of local and personal sanitary prophylaxis as employed in England may be properly adopted as one of our aids in the prevention of cholera. I need not enter into the detail of such rules and regulations for local purification ; they are read of all men in the current literature of the day. Neither will I expand on the idea of personal hygiene, which demands of the individual the same precautions as of the municipality, viz., cleanliness, attention to the habits of living, inspection of water supply, and simple character of food to insure a simply healthful mode of living in the presence of bodily danger. The use of recently boiled water, both for drinking and household purposes, is perhaps the most potent personal safeguard. Ice should not be placed in water that has been boiled for drinking purposes, but may surround the vessel containing it.

An eminent practitioner in England, almost universally known throughout the medical world for his remarkable success in a special line of operative surgery without the use of antiseptics, on being asked to explain his phenomenal record said : "I keep my finger nails clean." This homely phrase is an index to the cleanliness required as a personal safegard.

In the general consideration of the nature of cholera, it may be said, for the purpose of explaining the need of personal safeguards, that, in its method of propagation, it is similar to typhoid fever, with which our citizens are much more familiar. Typhoid fever is a disease entirely dependent for its continued existence on filth conditions, and as the public is fairly well educated upon

the need of certain sanitary precautions in the management of typhoid fever, it may be said that the same cautionary rules apply with regard to cholera. The germ is found in the vomited matter and bowel discharges of cholera, and persons having immediate care of cases should remember that the safeguard is again and again scrupulous attention to the cleanliness of the hands, which are the vehicles of transporting the germ from the sick to the well.

One of the most important safeguards is the prompt publication of truthful reports of the appearance of the disease, to enable health authorities to act intelligently. This is a prime necessity. No public end is subserved by calling cholera "cholerine."

PRESENT SAFEGUARDS.

As early as July 8 the general government issued an order—by circular—forbidding the entry of vessels or merchandise likely to carry cholera from cholera-infected districts, unless they had undergone a process of disinfection specified in that order; and our consuls abroad were cabled to give the steamship companies information of this action.

On August 17 the general government directed that all personal effects and baggage of immigrants from the districts infected with cholera should be disinfected abroad at ports of departure, and required as evidence of compliance with this order a certificate from the consular officer. This was to take effect September 18, the intervening time being allowed to enable the steamship companies to prepare the disinfecting plants; but cholera having been declared epidemic in Hamburg, another order was issued August 24, providing that the personal effects and baggage of all emigrants from European and Asiatic ports should be disinfected before departure, this provision going into immediate effect except with regard to baggage afloat at date of the order.

August 19 it was ordered that rags from *all* foreign ports, whether free from infection or not, should bear consular certificate of disinfection abroad on and after September 20, and that rags from any *infected* district be absolutely prohibited on and after date of the order, exception being made of rags then afloat.

I have before alluded to the final move of the general government in providing safeguards which is to be found in the circular of September 1, approved by the President, requiring a twenty

days' quarantine of all vessels carrying emigrants from any ports. The quarantine power of detention possessed by the States is thus used to practically suspend immigration. On the Canadian border medical inspectors, in addition to the regular customs and immigrant inspectors, have been appointed at the prominent railroad crossings, and lake and river ports, to inspect European immigrants and enforce the provisions of the above mentioned treasury circulars and the regulations of the local health authorities.

The method of handling infected vessels, as conducted by the national and State health authorities, is the selection of isolated points where hospital and detention barracks are set up, manned by commanding officers who have under their control such numbers of assistants as are required by the work to be done. At some of the national quarantines placed by law under the control of the Marine-Hospital Service, there are specially constructed vessels, as part of the equipments of these stations called disinfecting steamers, carrying apparatus for introducing sulphur fumes, steam, and mercuric bichloride solutions into the infected vessel while lying alongside. At these points also there is room for the erection of temporary camps for the deportation of immigrants for detention, and for the treatment of the sick while the vessels and baggage of the passengers are being disinfected. In the disease under consideration the sulphur disinfection, which is effective in yellow fever, is inadequate, and it is necessary to rely on the use of pure steam unmixed with air at 100° C. (212 Fahr.) for clothing and baggage to destroy the vitality of the comma bacillus of cholera. I need not enter into the technical detail of the process other than to say that it should be conducted in closed iron chambers or tanks with the pieces of clothing separately spread out on racks to insure complete penetration of the articles during the space of half an hour.

FUTURE SAFEGUARDS.

Among the required safeguards of the future, for this scourge will always be an impending one for this country as long as our commerce with the sources of supply are so uninterrupted, will be, in addition to the establishment of a national maritime quarantine, as above outlined:

First, Cremation of the bodies of the victims who may die on our shores of cholera, as there will always be the danger from

ground infection for an indefinite time after the inhumation of such bodies.

Second, Enactment of laws to suspend immigration under conditions like the present.

Third, Regulation of Mohammedan pilgrimages. There can be no doubt that the Mohammedan religion is largely responsible for the spread of cholera throughout the nations of Christendom. The annual pilgrimages to Mecca required of the devotees of that faith are to a great extent transported along the Red Sea and Suez Canal towards Mecca in the vessels of Christian nations who engage in that traffic year after year during the pilgrimage months, and thence pursue their commercial avocation as ocean tramps, with their infected hulks and crews, along the Mediterranean and European ports. In another place I have officially described the unspeakable horrors of these pilgrimages. The mortality of these trailing masses of humanity on their way to and from the shrines has been known to be as high as 600 daily. It is a question which interests Christendom whether there should not be an international agreement to prohibit the vessels of Christian nations from engaging in this traffic. And it is a matter for international consideration whether some steps should not be taken to compel a cessation of disease-spreading pilgrimages.

Should the disease gain an entrance to this country nevertheless, on account of the timely warning and general municipal and domestic cleaning that has followed and because of the more perfect sanitary organizations of the present day, it is believed that it can be kept within narrow limits. It is not indigenous here. The conditions have never been favorable to it, and probably never will be.

It cannot be said that persons are frightened into the cholera, but it may be said that too great anxiety will engender such conditions of the system as make it an easy prey should the opportunity occur for the infection of the person. In the face of an epidemic it has been aptly remarked by some one that, while presence of mind is a good thing, absence of body is better; and to those who can with convenience leave an infected locality for the suburbs, this course will not only prove a personal safeguard, but will render more safe the condition of those who remain.

The history of all our epidemics of late years starts with an imported source of infection, and is an argument for the enactment

of more clearly-defined laws to furnish us with the means of protection against diseases which are the unhappy concomitants of foreign famine and oppression.

WALTER WYMAN.

PRESIDENT CHARLES G. WILSON:

PERHAPS the best sentence with which I can begin this article is this: The Health Department of the city of New York is thoroughly ready to deal with cholera, should it break out among us.

Every preparation has been made, every arrangement perfected, every man instructed in his work. From myself, as President of the Board of Health, to the messengers who will carry orders or information, every one is ready to fight the pest, should that fight be rendered necessary. It was Herbert Spencer, I think, who defined government as an organized protection afforded by one community to itself as against another, and to each individual against another. To this he might have added that government is an organized protection to the individual against himself. The Health Department of New York is at the present moment, high noon on this fifth of September, 1892, ready to protect the men, the women, and the children committed to its care. Nor is there one man or woman connected with it that does not feel the responsibility, that is not willing to devote the best brain and knowledge he or she possesses, to the service; that, should it be necessary, is not ready to lay down life itself in obedience to duty, as has been done before by those employed in the Health Department. All that science can do, has been done in the way of preparation for the work should the pest come; all that science can suggest to lessen the evil effects of the pest, should it break out, is either finished or now in course of completion.

Let me define the duties of the Board of Health. The work of keeping the disease out of the city lies within the province of the Health Officer of the Port, who, although *ex officio* a member of the Board of Health, is in this regard an independent official. Fortunately for all of us, the news service of the present day is so perfect that we had ample warning. Step by step from its origin in Meshed, Persia, among the pilgrims who gathered about the tomb of the Mohammedan saint, Riza, the eighth of the twelve Imams; along its line of march through Russia, until it reached

Hamburg, we noticed the progress of the disease. It spread to France and England, and we knew it would be but a short time before it reached the shores of America. As the majority of immigrants come to New York, there was the greater danger at this port. Fortunately for the people, they had Dr. W. T. Jenkins on guard as Health Officer, and splendid indeed has been his work. Every precaution had been taken long before the first of the pest ships, the "Moravia," arrived. When she came, the vigilance of Dr. Jenkins stopped her, just as it has stopped all other vessels that have come in carrying the deadly germs.

But should the germs pass the guard established by Dr. Jenkins, or should they find their way into the city through another channel, then we are ready for them.

When the number of deaths from the so-called cholerine in Hamburg made it apparent that this new disease was as fatal as cholera, the Board of Health met. Commissioner James J. Martin, the President of the Police Department, promised any coöperation of the police we might wish. Dr. Jenkins spoke of the precautions he meant to take. Dr. Bryant, as Health Commissioner, described the sanitary precautions necessary. Dr. Cyrus Edson, the Sanitary Superintendent, was called into consultation, and the experience of Dr. Janes, the Assistant Sanitary Superintendent, gathered during the last epidemic of cholera in this city, was laid before us. The plan of campaign, if I may so express myself, was mapped out with care and as rapidly as possible.

In one respect we were fortunate in having cholera to handle. Cholera being a disease, the germs of which must be actually taken into the mouth, we had certain well-defined channels to guard. Had the disease been one of those which can travel through the air, the work before us would have been much more complex. The first step was to look to the water supply. A consultation was held with Mayor Grant, Comptroller Myers, Commissioner Gilroy, and President Barker, of the Tax Department; three of them being members of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. To these gentlemen I explained what we wished done. As the result of this, the necessary inspection of the Croton watershed was made, and Mr. Gilroy issued orders to the various officials connected with the Water Bureau, calling on them for the utmost care.

The Mayor communicated with the heads of all departments,

asking them to constitute their employees sanitary inspectors *pro tem.* He requested the Street Cleaning Department to look to the streets, with the result that orders were given to clean the streets in a most thorough manner, and these orders were obeyed.

I directed Dr. Edson, the Sanitary Superintendent, to give orders to the inspectors of food to be especially vigilant. To give some idea of the resulting vigilance, I may say that to date 687,848 pounds of meat, fruit, vegetables, and milk, dangerous to health, have been destroyed. This vigilance will be continued.

The appropriation for the summer corps of physicians having been exhausted, an application was made to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for more money. This was granted without a negative vote, and it gave us fifty physicians, each one of whom had been tried either during the typhus fever outbreak or the small-pox season. These, added to the twenty medical inspectors under the control of the Chief Inspector of Contagious Diseases, Dr. Charles F. Roberts, gives us a body of thoroughly tried men.

But since the time when it seemed that cholera might come to us, many offers of service have been received from physicians and nurses. For the most part these have offered to serve without pay, should there be occasion for them. To them I am glad to offer the thanks of the Board of Health and of the public I may claim to represent, for their devotion.

The offer of the St. John's Guild must not be forgotten. Through Mr. John P. Faure, the Secretary, the Guild offered the Department its Floating Hospital. This is a barge especially fitted up for use as a hospital, and as it is the only thing of the kind in the harbor, the offer was one we were more than glad to accept. In the event that cholera should break out here, this floating hospital would enable us to isolate the victims in the most perfect manner, and to look after them under the very best conditions. By its aid we hope to have a low death rate in the event of the pest coming to us.

It became a part of my duty as the President of the Health Board to issue certain circulars. Although these were signed by me and by the Secretary, General Emmons Clark, it must be understood they were originated for the most part by Dr. Bryant, the Medical Commissioner of the Board.

The first published contained directions to the Sanitary Inspectors. It ordered the closing of old wells,—which might,

through seepage, be contaminated from the sewers,—the cleaning and disinfection of old vaults, school sinks and closets, depressed gutters and gutter covers, depressed yards, areas and sidewalks. It ordered all tenements and rookeries to be cleaned, disinfected, whitewashed and overhauled; yard hydrants, defective water pipes, roof leaders and sinks to be put in thorough repair; roofs—especially of tenement houses—to be cleaned and repaired, and covers to be provided for all roof tanks.

It may be well to explain the object of these orders. They struck at the breeding places of the allies of cholera, as well as of cholera itself. We desired to destroy all collections of matter which would supply the germs of other zymotic diseases, and, in the case of the roof tanks, to protect them in such a way that cholera germs could by no means enter them and thus poison the water they contained. These orders gave much work to the Sanitary Inspectors.

I then issued an order to Dr. Cyrus Edson, the Sanitary Superintendent, directing him to divide the tenement house portion of the city into cholera districts. Each of these was to be from one block upwards in size, according to the extent, severity, and location of the disease. To each he was to assign one or more physicians, either voluntary or otherwise, and one or more nurses. The inspectors were to make house-to-house visits, hunting up all persons afflicted with intestinal disease. They were to prescribe at once for all persons so afflicted, and to give sanitary directions as to food, drink, and care of the sick. All cases were to be reported at once. Extreme care in the examination of those exposed to infection was to be shown. The nurses were to be divided into relays, to attend to the food, ventilation and drink for the sick; to see that cleanliness was observed. All prescriptions made out by inspectors were to be kept on file by those making them up. Each district was to have one or two disinfectors, abundantly supplied with disinfectants from some central station. Houses in which cholera made its appearance were to be scrubbed everywhere with the bichloride solution, and all waste pipes and sinks were to be flushed with it. All rooms were to be fumigated, and all clothing or bedding was to be boiled in the solution or destroyed. Precautions were to be taken to watch symptoms, and every case of a suspicious nature was to be isolated at once. The Registrar of Vital Statistics was to notify the Inspector at once of any death

in his particular district. The most extreme cleanliness was to be insisted on, as well as the absolute isolation of all cases of disease and all persons exposed to it. All this machinery can now be put into operation within ten minutes after the report reaches the Department of the first case of cholera.

Under my orders, Dr. Roberts, the Chief Inspector of Contagious Diseases, issued a circular to the inspectors or other physicians having charge of cholera cases, giving them the most minute instructions as to the treatment and care necessary. These instructions are too purely medical in character to make them of interest here. Suffice it to say that they were compiled from the latest and best reports of treatment, and are as perfect as modern medical science can make them.

A circular issued September 1 to superintendents of ferries, railroads, manufactories, etc., is, however, of general interest to all, and this I think it wise to include in this article. It is :

Should cholera appear in this city, a temporary place for isolation and detention should be provided in ferry-houses, railroad depots, factories, etc., for such as may be taken ill thereat, or while riding on ferry-boats or railroads (street or steam), within this city. This room should be easily reached, and have a water-tight floor. Persons suffering from vomiting or purging should be placed in the room at once and the Health Board immediately notified. In it should be placed a barrel of disinfecting fluid (corrosive sublimate, 1 part to 500 parts of water), which fluid should be freely poured on all suspected cholera discharges (vomit and diarrhœal) before their removal (which should immediately follow disinfection) in a proper receptacle to a place of safety. When thoroughly saturated with the disinfecting fluid, the discharges may be thrown into the river or sewer.

All surfaces soiled with cholera discharges should be thoroughly scrubbed with the disinfectants, care being taken to permit none of the discharge to pass into cracks in the floor, or through them to the surface beneath.

The water-closets and urinals should be kept constantly and thoroughly cleansed and disinfected.

The floors of ferry-boats, ferry-houses, railroad cars and depots should be scrubbed daily after thorough disinfection. They should not be swept until after thorough sprinkling with the disinfecting solution; and the sweepings should be disinfected again before being thrown into the sewer or river.

The above regulations are issued for the government of railroads, ferries, factories, etc., in this city only, as regulations will doubtless be issued upon this subject by the State Board of Health and by the Health Boards of other cities.

Two other circulars are worthy of reprinting. The first reads :

Healthy persons "catch" cholera by taking into their systems through the mouth, as in their food or drink, or from their hands, knives, forks,

plates, tumblers, clothing, etc., the germs of the disease, which are always present in the discharges from the stomach and bowels of those sick with cholera.

Thorough cooking destroys the cholera germs, therefore:

DON'T eat raw, uncooked articles of any kind, not even milk.

DON'T eat or drink to excess. Use plain, wholesome, digestible food, as indigestion and diarrhœa favor an attack of cholera.

DON'T drink unboiled water.

DON'T eat or drink articles unless they have been thoroughly and recently cooked or boiled, and the more recent the cooking, and the hotter they are, the safer.

DON'T employ utensils in eating or drinking unless they have been recently put in boiling water, the more recently, the safer.

DON'T eat or handle food or drink with unwashed hands, or receive it from the unwashed hands of others.

DON'T use the hands for any purpose when soiled with cholera discharges; thoroughly cleanse them at once.

Personal cleanliness, and cleanliness of the sleeping rooms and their contents, and thorough ventilation should be rigidly enforced. Foul water-closets, sinks, Croton faucets, cellars, etc., should be avoided, and when present should be referred to the Health Board at once and remedied.

The successful treatment and the prevention of the spread of this disease demand that its earliest manifestations be promptly recognized and treated. Therefore:

DON'T doctor yourself for bowel complaint, but *get to bed* and send for the nearest physician *at once*. Send for your family physician; send to a dispensary or hospital; send to the Health Department; send to the nearest police station, for medical aid.

DON'T wait, but *send* at once. If taken ill in the street, seek the nearest drug store, dispensary, hospital or police station, and demand prompt medical attention.

DON'T permit vomit or diarrhoeal discharges to come in contact with food, drink or clothing. These discharges should be received in proper vessels, and kept covered until removed under competent directions. Pour boiling water on them, put a strong solution of carbolic acid in them—not less than one part of acid to twenty of hot soapsuds or water.

DON'T wear, handle or use any articles of clothing or furniture that are soiled with cholera discharges. Pour boiling water on them, or put them into it, and scrub them with carbolic acid solution mentioned above, and promptly request the Health Board to remove them.

DON'T be frightened, but do be cautious, and avoid excesses or unnecessary exposure of every kind.

The second circular gives directions, which, if followed by housekeepers, janitors, and all those having control of houses or flats, will lessen the chance of disease. It reads as follows:

All water-closets should be thoroughly flushed and cleaned immediately after being used, and no filth should be allowed to remain in or adhere to the bowl.

School sinks should be thoroughly flushed and the contents run off every morning before 7 o'clock. At the same time all filth should be re-

moved from the sides and bottom of the sinks, and they should be disinfected. The privy houses should be frequently cleaned and disinfected.

Special attention should be given to the flushing and disinfection of urinals.

I have written to little purpose if I have not made plain the earnestness with which the Board of Health of the city of New York has attacked the problem. No one but a man, who like myself has watched the work of the men connected with the Board, working with them day after day, can know the thought which has been given to the subject or can understand the over-mastering responsibility which has made itself felt so painfully. The people of New York should be proud of this service and devotion given to them without hesitation or question. If the pest comes, and if the preparations, the thought, the work will keep the death rate down, and will prevent such stories being told of New York as have come to us from Hamburg, then will we of the Board of Health count our anxiety as having been light indeed, and our duty as done.

CHARLES G. WILSON.

DR. SAMUEL W. ABBOTT:

FIRST; as to our knowledge of the natural history and general character of the disease.

In the U. S. government report upon the cholera epidemic of 1873 the following proposition is stated:

"Malignant cholera is caused by the access of a specific organic poison to the alimentary canal, which poison is *developed spontaneously* only in certain parts of India."

Still later the "Encyclopædia Britannica," 9th Ed., 1878, article Cholera, states as a cardinal principle, that "Cholera is *originally generated* in certain parts of India."

In the light of later researches it may be reasonably questioned how and why cholera should obey different natural laws in different countries. The commissions of 1883 and 1884 of the English, French and German governments, and especially of the latter government, showed beyond question that cholera is infectious, communicable, and in a very marked degree preventible. Its infectious nature had been tardily acknowledged during the few previous decades, but the exhaustive researches of Koch in Egypt and India in 1884 settled many doubtful points.

The life history of the cholera germ is not fully understood as yet, but the probable explanation of its endemicity, or habitual

occurrences in India, lies not in any theory of spontaneous genera tion, but in the fact that the climatic and meteorological conditions of that country offer the favorable conditions for its continuous preservation or growth outside the human body.

With reference to the direct cause of cholera, strictly speaking, filth does not cause it; overcrowding does not cause it; unripe or unsound food fruit does not cause it; insufficient food does not cause it; intoxicating drinks do not cause it.

Sunlight, moisture, heat, good soil and abundance of fertilizers, will not produce a harvest till the seed has been sown; since these are merely the favoring conditions of healthy growth, but not the prime cause, which exists in the seed itself sown broadcast upon the proper soil. Similar laws apply to the development and spread of the so-called filth-diseases. Filth, and especially filthy water, while it is not the cause of the disease, yet offers a favorable soil for the propagation of cholera when the cholera germ is once planted in it. Unripe fruit and indigestible food afford a favorable soil or condition, since cholera thrives in the presence of those conditions of the system which are produced by unripe fruit and bad food.

Overcrowding favors the growth of cholera, since density of population increases the liability to the spread of all infectious diseases without exception. Any one of a hundred people living upon an acre of land is far more likely both to contract and to communicate an infectious disease than any one of a similar hundred living upon a square mile, under conditions of equable distribution. Dr. Farr found that the mortality rate of the English people increased parallel with the density of the population, or, more exactly, as follows :

In districts where the density of population was 86 to the square mile the annual mortality rate was from 14 to 16 per 1,000 of the living population.

In districts where the density was 172, the mortality rate was 17 to 19.

In districts where the density was 255, the mortality rate was 20 to 22.

In districts where the density was 1,130, the mortality rate was 23 to 25.

In districts where the density was 3,400, the mortality rate was 26 and upwards.

The inebriate offers a favorable soil for the cultivation of cholera, since alcohol is a well-known poison, and produces the weakened physical condition which is favorable to the reception and growth of the infectious principle of the disease.

So far as its mode of propagation is concerned, cholera is *like* typhoid fever, in that the infectious principle or bacillus exists in, and is transmissible by, the discharges or excreta of the sick. It is *unlike* typhoid fever, since its onset is far more rapid, and its capacity for excessive multiplication far greater. In illustration of this point, cholera appeared at Quebec in 1832 in the person of an Irish emigrant who was taken ill June 8. Ten days later (June 18) there had been 2,516 cases, and 437 deaths from cholera in that city. The experience of Hamburg in the present season is of the same character.

PROGRESS IN PREVENTIVE MEASURES.—The following may be stated as essential means for the sanitary arrangement and control of cholera :

1. Absolute cleanliness, municipal, household and individual.
2. A faultless condition of the domestic supplies of food, water and ice.
3. Early diagnosis of the disease.
4. Isolation of the sick.
5. Disinfection.

All of the foregoing principles have been recognized for the past thirty years or more with the exception of that of disinfection, which has in recent years assumed increasing prominence. The necessity of an absolutely pure water-supply as an essential factor in the prevention of cholera and typhoid fever has also received a greater share of attention since the peculiar mode of transmission of these diseases has become recognized.

The earlier instructions relative to disinfection were vague and deficient in the support of actual experimental proofs of its value. Charcoal and sulphate of iron were both recommended previous to 1880 as "destructive disinfectants," the former having no such power and the latter only in a limited degree. (U. S. Report, 1873, p. 69.) After experimental inquiry had been inaugurated to determine the value of disinfectants, sulphurous acid fumes came into general use in connection with all infectious diseases "dangerous to public health" for the disinfection of apartments which had been occupied by the sick, while corrosive sublimate in solution was advised for disinfecting the excreta of the sick, and the clothing and utensils worn and used by them.

The difficulty in applying sulphurous acid, its liability to abuse, and the possibility of inefficient destructive action upon

living germs under ordinary conditions, have led to a considerable degree of distrust as to its efficiency ; and the extremely poisonous nature of corrosive sublimate, together with an uncertainty as to its action in the presence of certain organic compounds, and its corrosive action upon plumbing fixtures, have caused serious apprehension in regard to its general use as a disinfectant. Of the efficiency of prolonged high temperatures, either by steaming, boiling, or baking, as well as of destruction by fire, there is no question.

One of the best modern circulars upon disinfection for cholera is that which was issued by the German government, bearing date of July 28, 1892, at Berlin. Its concise and practical character should lead to its general adoption. Hence I take the liberty to quote that portion which relates to the substances to be employed :

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DISINFECTION IN CHOLERA.

THE MEANS TO BE EMPLOYED.

1. *Milk of Lime.* (Quick lime slaked by water, as in the preparation of ordinary white-wash.) Proportions: one quart of broken lime to one gallon of water gradually added.

2. *Chloride of lime* may be used either in powder or solution, the latter to be made by mixing two parts of chloride of lime with 100 parts of water.

For this purpose chloride of lime is only useful when fresh and evolving its well-known odor.

3. *Solution of Potash Soap.* Three parts of soap to be dissolved in 100 parts of hot water.

4. *Solution of Carbolic Acid.* To twenty parts of the soap-solution (3) while warm, add one part of carbolic acid and stir it in.

For the purer qualities of carbolic acid simple water may be used without the soap.

5. *Steam Apparatus.* Either apparatus may be used ; that which is arranged for the direct application of steam at 212° F. (100° C.) or that for superheated steam.

6. *Boiling* the articles to be disinfected for half an hour, the boiling to be constant, and the articles to be well covered by the water.

Full instruction for the use of the foregoing disinfectants are also published in the circular. The objects being, first of all, the excreta of the sick, the hands and other exposed parts of the body, the bed-linen, underclothing, furniture, floors, walls of rooms, pavements, gutters, privies, and all objects liable to infection.

Disinfecting Stations.—There is no question of a public sanitary nature in which the large cities of the United States are so far behind as in the adoption of public disinfection stations for the disinfection of all portable articles which require disinfection ; that is to say, public buildings, or plants, not necessarily expen-

sive, but fully equipped with all the appliances for disinfecting such household articles as may be brought to them for the purpose, such as bedding, mattresses, clothing, blankets, carpets and upholstery. The stations of this character which the writer visited last year in Berlin and Paris are models in every particular. The principal point in these stations worthy of mention is the absolute separation of all infected from disinfected material by means of an impervious wall running through the building.

In this wall the steam apparatus is placed. Two sets of employees, horses, carriages, implements, and apartments are in use, with no communication between them. One set is employed to collect the infected articles and convey them to the station, where they are placed in the disinfectant apparatus, and the door is closed ; after being disinfected they are taken out by another set of operatives by a door on the opposite end and carried back to the houses, which have also been disinfected.

Well-equipped stations of this character should be at once established in every city of the United States having a population of 50,000. These would constitute an efficient aid to the means already employed for combating not only cholera, but also all dangerous diseases of the infectious class.

SAMUEL W. ABBOTT.

DR. CYRUS EDSON:

THE cholera now knocking vainly, as we all hope, at the doors of this country, is rightly one of the most dreaded diseases known to mankind. Modern scientific research has merely confirmed the hereditary fear which came down to us from the dark ages. We can thoroughly appreciate and sympathize with the cry of the ancients when they called it the "Scourge of God." For if in the absence of the knowledge we have to-day of this disease we were forced to remain passive and watch thousands die around us, ignorant alike of the cause of their death, the prevention of other deaths and the treatment of the sick, we would be inclined to attribute to supernatural causes that which actually is part of the water we drink.

To-day cholera affords us a most striking instance of the fact that science has relegated superstition to the past. In the light of to-day we see clearly the following well-proven realities : 1st. Cholera is the result of introducing into our digestive systems the

cholera bacillus. 2d. No person can have cholera unless that bacillus is so introduced. 3d. The bacillus reaches us mainly through the channels of drink and food. 4th. The bacillus infects these channels from the excretions of persons sick with the disease. 5th. The bacillus can be easily killed before or even after it reaches drink and food. 6th. When the bacillus is so killed there is absolutely no danger to the person swallowing it.

With these given facts before us we can fight cholera.

As to whether we shall have to make the fight I have nothing to say. The Health Officer of the port of New York is doing all that science, backed by intense earnestness and untiring work, can do to keep the germs out. He may succeed and the guardian of some other entrance fail. But if the germs do reach us, and the disease does break out, then as to the question, Can we successfully fight it and prevent an outbreak from becoming an epidemic? I have much to say.

The drinking water of a people is always the channel through which the greatest number of infections come.

It is the foul water-courses and tanks of India that make cholera endemic there. The Croton water which is supplied to the people of New York is reasonably pure. More than that, the Croton watershed is carefully watched, and is not exposed to contamination. More yet, if cholera were to break out among us the Croton watershed could be so watched and guarded as to make it almost impossible for the water to be contaminated by a cholera-infected person. Again, boiling the water will kill the bacilli, and owing to the almost universal habit of reading newspapers, I question whether enough men or women live in New York, ignorant of this simple precaution, to make an epidemic of cholera.

So far as other channels through which the germs might reach their victims are concerned, such as contamination of the hands from infected materials and subsequent contamination of food and the like, there are two things worthy of consideration: During the winter and spring of this year New York city was confronted with a sudden outbreak of typhus fever. This outbreak, still fresh in the public mind, was not only sudden, but the number of those suffering from the disease and those who had been exposed to it was unusually large. The outbreak had acquired a strong foothold among us. Notwithstanding this, the disease was grappled with, hemmed in, and finally stamped out.

To a community in the temperate zone, with a water supply like Croton, typhus fever is far more dangerous than cholera. I am justified in saying that an outbreak of cholera could be more easily handled and stamped out than typhus actually was.

An epidemic of cholera cannot occur in a community protected by enforced health laws without accidental contamination of the water supply, while the contagion of typhus may be spread through the medium of the air we breathe. It follows, therefore, that as the medium of the one is air and of the other water and food, we have with cholera tangible things to handle.

The germs of cholera can be caught and destroyed almost to a certainty, while those of typhus are more rapidly disseminated. The latter have yet to be seen separated and artificially cultivated by man. Another fact is of great importance here. The germs or, perhaps better, the infective principles of typhus are projected from a person in the exhalations from the lungs and the body. The bacilli of cholera can only come from the bowels, or from the stomach when the sufferer vomits. It follows then that there must be an infinitely greater number of germs put forth by typhus than by cholera patients. More than that, while the management and disinfection or killing of the germs from a typhus patient is to the last degree difficult, because they are in the air of the room in which he is, those from a cholera patient can be easily handled and killed. As I have already said they are in the discharges either from the bowels or stomach, AND NOWHERE ELSE. They can be treated with disinfectants that kill them at once in the vessels into which they are received, or on the spot where they are accidentally or involuntarily discharged.

In view of the fact that the New York Health Department has had ample warning, that all its preparations have been made, that it stamped out an outbreak of typhus when no preparations had been made, that cholera is easier to handle than is typhus; I have no hesitation in saying that while we may have an outbreak of cholera if the various quarantines should prove ineffectual, that outbreak will not become an epidemic in New York city.

The Health Department of New York has fought many diseases and is not afraid of a fight with cholera should it come. I hope that we shall never have a chance to win that fight.

CYRUS EDSON, M. D.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE ETHICS OF GREAT STRIKES.

ALTHOUGH strikes are generally wasteful methods of gaining desired ends, the conclusion cannot be justified by the experience of labor organizations that they are always harmful in their results and influences. Organization and coöperation are the surest means by which labor can demand its rights, and strikes in a just cause should be simply the determined expression of organized resistance. The waste which is always involved in a strike is simply a law of human progress.

Labor organizations have accomplished great concessions for the workingmen, and strikes and lockouts, as a feature of them, must be credited with their due share of the victory.

Strikes in England and the United States present a long list of losses, and when the statistics are first presented the impression is gained that they do a tremendous amount of harm, and accomplish little or no good. The loss falls heaviest and most directly upon the laborers, but eventually the mill-owners and capitalists feel the result of a strike. Fifty years ago the term was hardly known in the English language, but during the last half century it has become loaded with a weight of meaning which must be heeded. So rapidly have strikes followed each other, and on such gigantic scales, that about one hundred million dollars have been lost in wages by the working population in the present decade, while destruction to property and mill-owners must aggregate much more than this sum.

In the great strike of 1852, in which the Amalgamated Engineers of England struck against overtime and piece-work, the loss of wages was tremendous, and the cost to the society during the three months of the strike amounted to over $200,000. In 1853-54 the spinners struck at Preston, England, and the loss of wages to the 20,000 laborers easily aggregated $15,000,000, while the union, it is estimated, lost actually in money over $3,000,000. In 1859 twenty-four thousand laborers in the building trade began a strike which lasted nearly a month, occasioning a loss of many hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Welsh colliers' strike in 1873 lasted nearly four months, and two years later 60,000 men in the same district remained out for about five months. The exact amount of loss through these strikes has never been fully estimated, but the waste must have been tremendous.

In 1877 there was a general movement among laboring men throughout the world to secure better pay and shorter hours, and the masons of London stopped all business in their line for nearly a year. Masons were obtained from Germany and Belgium, and the London strikers lost through wages nearly half a million dollars. The year 1878 was also famous for its large

strikes, notably those of the spinners of Lancashire and the engineers of Liverpool and Birkenhead.

In the United States similarly large and momentous strikes have marked the history of labor organizations and unions. In 1877 the most violent and sanguinary strike was witnessed in this country, when the railway servants throughout a good part of the country struck to prevent a reduction in wages. The strike ended in riots, and it is estimated that $40,000,000 worth of property was destroyed, and many lives. The loss through the men's wages was on a proportionate scale. In 1882 the ironworkers in the United States conducted an extensive strike, which lasted for several months.

There is another loss brought on by strikes which is not always considered. It acts harmfully on the community, and sometimes a severe strike will drive a trade or industry completely from that part of the land. As notable instances of this, mention might be made of the shipbuilding trade at Dublin, the lace trade at Nottingham, and the silk trade at Macclesfield. Many of England's cotton manufactures have been forced to America, while it is well known that France and Belgium have stolen a good part of her machine-making works.

The loss falls upon three different classes. The common laborers and strikers feel it first, then the capitalists or mill-owners, and finally the community itself.

The success or failure of the strikes cannot be measured always by the actual results in dollars and cents. Neither is the accomplishment or failure of the purpose desired always the criterion by which to judge. The vast majority of the strikes have failed. A compromise or slight concession has been more often the chief thing acquired. The individual strikes have only helped to make up a solid wall of resistance to oppression, and in the aggregate they have wrought good.

But the seeds of the discontent were sown by the early English law when efforts were made to compel laborers to work. Soon after the great plague in England all labor was scarce and high. The government then, in the supposed interest of the industries, attempted to fix the wages of workmen, and imposed severe penalties upon those who demanded or received more. Subsequent legislation made every man or woman who had no property or visible means of support work at a fixed sum for any employer who desired his labor. The pillory and the method of cutting off the ears were the penalties imposed upon those who refused to labor for their masters. These selfish enactments bred a feeling of hatred among the laboring men against their employers, and every attempt to fix the rate of wages by the government signally failed. The workmen were forced to give more than a just equivalent for their wages. Efforts to secure higher wages, or fewer working hours per day, followed, and until 1825 these coöperative attempts were punished as conspiracies.

It was from such a beginning that strikes developed. By coöperation and strikes the laborers removed many of the difficulties in their way, and the true success of labor-unions and their accompanying strikes must be judged by a comparison between the condition of the laboring classes of to-day and that of one hundred years ago. The general trend of the labor movements has been so decidedly towards an improvement in the condition of the workmen that success rather than failure must be conceded to them in the aggregate. Strikes were necessary in the early days when arbitration was unknown. Arbitration is the civilized method of settling labor difficul-

ties, but the public mind had to be educated up to it at first. Strikes were as justifiable in the days when labor was not protected by law as wars are when one nation oppresses a weaker one. They played their part in the great labor history of the world by preparing the reasoning mind for a better appreciation of the rights and wrongs existing between workmen and their employers.

If arbitration was the natural outcome of strikes, the day has nearly passed when the latter should be attempted. Where there is determined oppression and tyranny strikes will still be ordered. There is an ethical side to them, then, which makes them justifiable. It is a sure indication that labor has reached a higher standard than industry, and that it is necessary to return to semi-civilized methods to teach the latter the spirit of the age. But where strikes are ordered without giving arbitration the chance to settle the dispute then labor invites the condemnation of all upon the cause.

GEORGE ETHELBERT WALSH.

POLITICS AND THE WEATHER.

IT HAS been at times a consolation to me to reflect that the weather depended solely on the caprice of fortune, and not on the will of my fellow men. Perhaps some one may think that this is immaterial, and that it can make no difference whether an unpropitious sky is due to human agency or not. No difference indeed! It is the same difference that exists between a sick bed and a torture chamber. But, alas! man is trying to lay his sacrilegious hand on the clouds and wring water from them at his pleasure. But it is the social and political aspect of the subject that I wish to consider.

It is clear that private and so-called irresponsible persons could not be suffered to try experiments in rain making at their own sweet will. No man could be permitted to deluge his neighbor's washed clothes or discourage his young turkeys for the sake of refreshing his own lettuce beds. To allow every man with a can of dynamite to make rain whenever he wanted to would be absurd and unbearable. It is evident that the matter must be in the hands of the government, for, if not, the course of the weather might be seriously disturbed by differences of policy, or even by local jealousy. There would be nothing, for example, to prevent the Governor of New York from drenching New England on Fast Day because the delegates from Massachusetts had knifed him at the last Presidential convention.

No doubt it will be a good while before the officers in charge of the rain-making apparatus have acquired enough experience to produce satisfactory results; but this would be of more importance in some other countries than here, where new men are appointed to office every four years and the oil of consecration imparts an immediate capacity for office. No doubt also there will be a good deal of grumbling; because in matters that interest everybody it is impossible to please all the world, and some men are sure to talk about corrupt bargains and wicked jobs. But no such slanders will be generally credited; for if our system of political parties has the disadvantage of making half the people listen credulously to malicious tales about public men, it has at least the merit that the other half will never believe anything evil of their rulers. On the other hand, in a country mercifully free like ours from bureaucracy and red tape, the weather will not be regulated by rigid principles, but by elastic ones, so that it can be adapted to the varying wants of the people; that is, of the people in the scientific sense. I say scientific sense because the popular use of the word is entirely wrong and leads to great

confusion. In the popular sense the word means the whole mass of citizens, but if the progress of democracy has proved anything, it has proved that an unorganized mass of men is almost as ineffective in political as in military matters. When, therefore, we use the word people in scientific discussion we mean the people as it is organized politically. If the reader has grasped the definition, I will repeat that the weather will be adapted to the varying wants of the people. When anyone wants rain he will apply for it through the regularly organized channels. He will go to his Congressman, if a member of the party in power, or to the local boss, or to a friend who has contributed largely to the campaign fund.

Oversensitive people may be shocked to think that the weather bureau will be affected by any such motives, but let such persons consider that if a man owes his office to influence, influence must inevitably control his administration of it. Moreover, people of this stamp have always bewailed every step in the march of progress.

At the dawn of history, when the only occupation of men in times of peace was the tilling of the soil, every man relied on his own skill for the supply of his humble wants. But, little by little, separate occupations began arise. A man gifted with a talent for reciting verses travelled round the country and got his living by singing about the brave old times before the world degenerated. This is the origin of the profession of poet, of composer, and of actor. Again, a man who was clever at working wood or stone or bronze was hired by other men; and hence the rise of artizans and the mechanic arts. The lawyer had a similar origin. In his case, indeed, we can see very clearly the steps in the process of development, because he was still supposed to act gratuitously long after the law became a regular profession; and even at the present day the barristers in England have no legal claim to fees for their services,—they alone among all classes in the community being expected to practise a virtue which is its own reward.

The division of labor and specialization of occupations are in reality the result of men's learning to exercise for hire their peculiar skill. The advance of civilization is, therefore, constantly attended with the formation of new occupations; and it is safe to say that there is no power or aptitude to be found in man that is not certain sooner or later to be the basis of a separate profession. Society has now become so flexible that the great need of the present day is for men who can influence others. The rise of the brokers is an example of this; but there is a demand for influence in political as well as in financial matters, and we can begin to discern already a class of men who are coming forward to supply this want; for example, the lobbyist and the local boss.

It is not yet clear what the ultimate form of the great profession which is to practise political influence will be. It is still in its infancy, and there is a feeling that it ought to be practised gratuitously,—an idea which shows a lamentable ignorance of business principles. A more rational opinion is, however, beginning to prevail. Massachusetts has already given to the lobby a legal status, while the work of the boss is generally recognized as a regular occupation. The sale, indeed, of official power for cash is not yet considered respectable; but the propriety of using office to benefit one's party or one's friends, or to reward supporters who have worked or employed their influence to help the election, seems to be generally admitted. The traffic in official influence is still, for the most part, in the stage of barter, which is an earlier and more primitive form of sale. But the sale for

money develops from barter just as certainly and naturally as the frog does from the tadpole.

When the development of influence as a marketable commodity has become complete it will produce profound changes in our political life. To some extent, indeed, it will destroy democracy itself, for it will put all political power into the hands of money. Yet the theory I have propounded is evidently correct, for if not it would be impossible to account for the popular apathy about corruption in public life, and this theory can alone explain the fact that so little indignation is aroused by the abuse of official power and by the violation of the most sacred of all trusts.

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

A TAX ON TALES.

THANKS to International Copyright, much has been said about the duties of government towards authorship. It is now strongly felt that the reciprocal debt of authors to the State, and its vital part, the treasury, should be paid. "Protect the product of the brain," cry all the friends of letters. "By all means," is the response; "but," in the words of Pooh Bah, "*for a consideration.*"

Every civilized state recognizes the propriety of taxing whiskey and tobacco. Our day is bringing forth abundantly another product closely akin in its nature to these luxuries or necessities. Like them it is a product which may have a good or an evil effect upon consumers, and public policy demands its control by the State. Like them it promises large rewards to its producers, and generally enriches them in pleasure and pride if not in purse. Its production is growing at such a pace that no man can view it with unconcern. This product is the Short Story.

Its manufacture is limited apparently by no trammels of age, place, or previous condition of aptitude for writing. All persons, young and old, who can spell words of one syllable, and some who cannot, believe they can write stories. An enumeration of the tens of thousands in the land who at least once have tried their hand at it, is omitted from the census. Even more astonishing figures are lost in the passing over of those who are wont to say: "If I only had time I should write down that story of mine and send it to a magazine." Pitiful in comparison would be the numbers of the modest who suspect that their work might not succeed.

No figures, however, are necessary to prove the extent and vigor of this new growth. Two minutes at a railway news-stand are enough to convince the most skeptical. Every imaginable form of story, in periodical garb the most various, is represented. That the production of the short story has a positive economic standing is thus shown, for the supply is clearly ready to meet the demand. Is it not then a product to be counted among taxable commodities, and is not an overstrained treasury to benefit from the condition which confronts us? The question deserves the attention of tariff reformers who would sweep away at one stroke a bountiful source of revenue.

Let them, therefore, consider, first, how easily the tax could be imposed. The illicit and underhand production of tales is extremely slight. Nearly every one who writes a story talks about it. His neighbors know what he is doing, and, especially in small communities, the postmaster is in a position to do the government's work of collection, on either the first or the second passage of the manuscript through the mail. Writers of the more

secretive sort—the guinea-hens of literature, who make a mystery of their nest and eggs—could no more evade our present revenue officials than moonshiners or Havana smugglers. The obstacles to the effective imposition of the tax are hardly worth considering.

In determining the rates of taxation there might be difficulties, but they are far from insuperable. Practical legislators would ask at once, Shall the tax be specific or *ad valorem*, and, if *ad valorem*, who shall fix the value, the author or an official? The author would be torn by a desire on the one hand to estimate his work at the high value it assumes in his own eyes, and on the other by the motives of economy bidding him reduce the tax to a minimum. Recourse might reasonably be had to the agencies that have grown up with the growth of the product. The so-called Literary Bureaus, already established for the sale of manuscripts, publish a schedule of commissions which supplies a fair basis for the taxes the authors have already manifested their willingness to pay. Here is a specimen of one of these actual statements:

"For reading any manuscript containing not more than 2,000 words, and giving a list of the periodicals to which it is best suited, 50 cents; if the manuscript contains more than 2,000 words, 25 cents additional for each additional thousand words or fraction thereof will be charged."

Building upon this material basis the scale might well be graded according to the nature of the stories. For example, a dialect tale of the first class, practically unreadable by nine men out of ten, ought to be worth more than a story in plain English, and should be taxed accordingly. A study in morbid psychology should yield more to the national treasury than a simple, old-fashioned love story. A line also might well be drawn between work of the realistic and the idealistic schools.

The producers themselves, if properly approached, might throw some light on the problem of valuations. Surely the assessors might expect some useful suggestions from such a business-like contributor to the magazines as the person who has been using letter-paper with the professional heading: "Religious and Secular Song-Writing. Orders Promptly Filled."

These are matters of minor detail, with which Congress is competent to deal. At the risk of appearing presumptuous, a leading clause for the bill which shall make taxation upon tales a fact may, by way of suggestion, be given:

"On and after July 1, 1893, each and every short story written within the boundaries and jurisdiction of the United States shall be subject to an internal revenue tax; said tax to be collected by the postmasters or revenue officials of each congressional district as the Board of Commissioners of Fiction—established as herein elsewhere provided for—shall determine; the rates of said tax to fall between 10 and 25 cents per 1,000 words, the maximum rate being applicable to the most difficult dialect, the minimum to compositions by persons under sixteen years of age."

It is confidently believed that these provisions would be for the public good. By their means government could impose a salutary check upon the production of inferior fiction, protect the people from the effects of over-indulgence, and reap a rich harvest from a flourishing, growing industry.

On broad economic grounds the scheme is upheld by the famous dictum of Adam Smith: "Every tax ought to be levied at the time, or in the manner, in which it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it." This statement convinces one of the great economist's foreknowledge of our day. That very word *contributor* is prophetic of the magazine age. In the fresh flush of authorship the writer hands the proper official the small sum to be

recorded against his name as a Producer of Short Stories. When is it more likely to be convenient—nay, a pleasure—for him to pay his tax?

The constitutionality of the tax is beyond question. Tobacco and whis key establish ample precedent. Indeed, so much is to be said in favor of this new form of revenue and so little against it, that the plan is earnestly commended to the consideration of Congress early in its next session.

M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE, JR.

BISMARCK AND THE EMPEROR.

PREFACING any judgment that may be suggested under the heading of this article by the statement that no one at so great a distance, and not immediately connected with the Court at Berlin, can know the facts of the case, it is nevertheless possible and interesting to consider from past observed facts what bearing the action of Prince Bismarck, in or out of the Reichstag in its coming session, may have on German politics in the next year. The situation is a most singular one. An aged Prime Minister, meriting all the glory his country can give him, is in opposition not to the government, but to his Emperor—possibly with right on his side. While the Emperor, who has his own life to lead and his own views to stand by, has perhaps as much right on his side. The Minister is too powerful to be allowed to speak his mind freely, and too great to be forcibly silenced.

It may not be amiss to review briefly the events that have led up to the present peculiar situation. On the last day of December, 1888, Prince Bismarck, then Chancellor of the German Empire, Foreign Minister, and President of the Prussian Ministry, received a letter from Emperor William II. The young monarch, deploring the death of his father and grandfather, congratulated himself on still having by him the Iron Prince. "From the bottom of his heart" he desired the Chancellor's health and happiness, and he "prayed Heaven that he might long be permitted to work with him for the welfare and greatness of the Fatherland."

Through the year 1889 it became evident that the Chancellor and the Emperor had a difficult task before them. Both were strong-willed, the Emperor quite as strong-willed as the Chancellor. One was seventy years of age, full of experience and with nearly half a century of history behind him, which he had practically made; the other was scarcely thirty and with nothing behind him to show what qualities he had. One had the experience and ability to form policies of government and the other had the authority to enforce them. Two such men could not work together, if they believed in opposite policies.

As the year passed the Emperor showed his determination to take active part in the conduct of affairs. He dealt directly with Socialistic questions, showed a desire to examine into the Labor troubles, and favored a policy otherwise at variance with that of his Chancellor. Furthermore, he disapproved of Bismarck's persecution of Dr. Geffcken, and strongly objected when he heard of the Chancellor's plan to win over the Ultramontanes with the restoration of the Duke of Cumberland and the Guelph Fund. Similar incidents, that came to light from time to time during the year, showed a determination on the part of the Emperor to treat his Chancellor more as the president of his Council of Ministers than as a Prime Minister. He even issued orders and received reports directly to and from ministers in charge of the different departments, without consulting his Chancellor; all of which in Bismarck's opinion should have passed through his hands

first. Such methods were, tantamount to saying that a Prime Minister was unnecessary, and thereupon, on the 18th of March, 1890, Bismarck resigned his three offices, and retired to Friedrichsrühe, his country seat.

That the resignation was not distasteful to his master is evident from his acceptance of it within two days; and, thus, fifteen months from the date at which the Emperor's letter of congratulation was dispatched to Bismarck, the latter's resignation was accepted, even courted.

A field-marshalship was offered to the Prince, which he accepted, and a continuance of the emoluments of his offices, and the title of Duke of Lauenburg, both of which he refused. In the same month, March, 1890, the Emperor, at a banquet of the Provincial Diet of Brandenburg, said that any one who would help him in his work he would welcome heartily, but any one who opposed him he would *zerschmettern*, which might be vulgarly but literally translated, "smash to pieces." and the inference was clear.

After Bismarck's retiremeut to Friedrichsrühe certain journals took up his cause, the *Hamburger Nachrichten* and the *Münchene Allgemeine Zeitung*. Though these journals were generally accepted as Bismarck's organs, it is only certain that occasional articles have been printed directly at his request. These papers disapproved of the new government's policy towards Russia, of the increased friendliness towards England, and of the concessions made to her in Africa. Meantime the Emperor referred to these attacks in his speeches and threatened the source from which they came, if they were continued. Bismarck on his side must have been notified by the Court at Berlin that his attacks did not please the high authority there, for he threw out inferences that he was not to be bridled simply because he was out of power. He said, for example, to a deputation of Berliners, who came to him at Friedrichsrühe on the 22d of June, 1890, that he felt like a man who had left the stage and gone into the pit: but that, nevertheless, a pit ticket entitled him to the privilege of applauding or hissing as he desired, so long as he did not whistle shrilly. He said that he was out of office, but could not be deprived of his intellect, and would not submit to dictation.

Matters grew worse as time went on, and in the winter of 1890 the Emperor seemed to go out of his way to show his disfavor of the ex-Chancellor. Moltke was showered with honors at the latter's expense, and the play of "Der Neue Herr" offered another opportunity for the Emperor to show his displeasure. Herr Wildenbruch wrote the play wherein the Great Elector, of historic memory, is represented as discharging his sometime valuable minister who had turned against him. When the play was set on the stage, William II. made corrections in it and attended performances night after night—all of which could have reference only to the incident at hand.

Bismarck's reputed interviews became more caustic and unguarded, and in one of them he called the Emperor "*Der Junge Mann.*" This created considerable commotion among the journals, and the retired Chancellor probably received another intimation from the Court that he had committed an error. But it is a difficult matter to terrorize one who never knew what it is to feel fear.

In April, 1891, Bismarck was persuaded to run as a candidate of the National-Liberal party for the Reichstag from the constituency of Geestemünde. He failed to secure a majority on the first ballot, but on the second he received 10,500 votes to 5,500 for his opponent. He did not enter the Reichstag last year, on the ground that his health would not admit of it, but he said that he should do so in the coming session.

Finally, notice appeared in the journals that the marriage of Count Herbert Bismarck in Vienna, in June, would be attended by the ex-Chancellor. Before the bridal party started official notice had been sent to the German Ambassador at Vienna not to attend the wedding or take official cognizance of the presence of Bismarck in the city. A similar request as to Bismarck was also sent to the Austrian Court.

In June the party started from Friedrichsrühe, and all along the route the journey resembled the voyage of a conqueror. It was an unmistakable sign of the preference—at least of a portion of the German nation—for the fallen Chancellor over the Emperor. Stations were crowded with deputations, speeches were made, and Bismarck replied. At Vienna the Russian Ambassador was the only diplomat of high standing present at the wedding. Immediately afterwards, before leaving the city, the Prince had an interview with the editor of a Liberal journal, in which he said that while Chancellor he had kept the personal friendship of the Czar; that the Czar had told him that he trusted him implicitly, and Bismarck had replied that he was certain to remain minister for life; that with the "new era," however, begun at his retirement, the friendly relations with Russia had become strained. And he gave out a hint that Germany's position in regard to Russia was greatly weakened by the appointment of Caprivi. These utterances were followed on the last of July by a patriotic speech at Kissingen from Bismarck to the South Germans. These again created unlimited comment.

The government has at last seen the wisdom of remaining quiet, but how long this silence will be maintained cannot be told. Caprivi up to the present has only answered the Vienna interview by publishing the note sent to the powers in May, 1890, notifying them that Bismarck's utterances did not represent the sentiments of the Foreign Office.

The situation stands, therefore, in some such position as this, and the Reichstag opens at the end of October: Will Bismarck enter the German parliament and lead the opposition? The situation is further complicated, because on the appointment of Caprivi it became patent to the world that he was only a figure-head, and that the Emperor was his own Prime Minister. If a minister commits an error he can retire, and one of the opposition takes his place. But an Emperor, when he makes a mistake, cannot retire, but stands for the rest of his life accused. And for the Emperor William to become his own minister is of itself a great risk. The young ruler has a hundred times stated his beliefs with a courage that every one must admire, and the bare fact that he cannot change them makes his position a doubly difficult one, when it is added to the opposition of the greatest statesman in Europe, so strong even in retirement. The Imperial throne has been in existence too short a time to bear up under too much opposition.

On the other hand, to bring such a magnificent man as Bismarck into the courts of the country he has himself created would be a difficult thing for even an Emperor to do.

It is probable that Bismarck will not enter the Reichstag, because he has so often disregarded its rules that it might entangle him in its meshes out of revenge; but if he does, and if he succeeds in putting the Emperor's policy in a minority, there is sure to be a deadlock. The Emperor has shown himself not the one to yield. And yet, in the event suggested, the country would stand against him.

JOSEPH HAMBLEN SEARS.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXII.

NOVEMBER, 1892.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1892.

BY THE HON. JAMES G. BLAINE.

THE lack of excitement and of active interest in the Presidential campaign of 1892 is a feature common to both parties. For a period of more than three months after the nominations were made, the country gave no intimation of any special concern in the result. Possibly this may indicate that henceforth Presidential elections will attract less absorbing attention than heretofore; that as the people grow more numerous they grow less partisan; and that all political elections seem of less moment to a Republic of sixty-five millions, engaged in business transactions of immense magnitude, than to a Republic of twenty millions, whose financial affairs bore not even a proportionate value to those of the Republic of to-day. The elder Harrison's campaign took place in a nation of seventeen millions of people. Every man in the country, nearly every woman, it may almost be said every child, was engaged for months in watching its progress and shaping its result. It would be impossible for the campaign of the younger Harrison to enlist the same degree of popular attention, and it would be a serious interference with the business of the country if it were possible. Vast commercial and financial operations supremely interest so many men that a large proportion of the population give no more attention to an election than simply to vote, and even this patriotic duty is too often neglected.

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE, All rights reserved.

An equally noticeable change is in the length of the letters of acceptance, and the freedom with which the respective candidates address public meetings and write letters on questions of interest that may arise during the canvass. Mr. Clay's letter accepting the Baltimore nomination, an affair of great moment, was comprised in a few lines, and Mr. Lincoln, who belonged rather to the modern than to the ancient period of the Republic, followed Mr. Clay's example, his whole expression of views being confined to a short paragraph. A strong warning against the writing of intermediate letters was found in the belief that Mr. Clay lost his election by frankly expressing his views on a question pending in the campaign. Mr. Lincoln was too shrewd to write a letter between his acceptance of the nomination and the election. Within the last twenty years, however, all this has changed. Speeches are made and letters are written freely by the Presidential nominees during the canvass, and the people become acquainted with the candidate's belief on every question that arises.

President Harrison has written a letter of acceptance which touches every point at issue. The letter is of unwonted length, but it makes a full exposition of every principle to which the Republican party is in anywise committed, with no attempt to withhold or conceal anything for which the Republican party may be justly held responsible, and with a fair review of the questions presented by the Democratic party. Every voter can read for himself, and decide for himself upon the issues in advocacy of which the Republican party goes before the country. Perhaps none of the President's predecessors have made so exhaustive, and none a more clear, presentation of the questions involved. Marked by his well-known cogency of expression, no further condensation could be made without the sacrifice of clearness.

It will be observed, however, that the President places his own explanation of party principles against the resolutions of the convention—commonly called the platform ; and it is not less observable that the resolutions of a convention have come to signify little in determining the position of President or party. Formerly the platform was of first importance. Diligent attention was given, not only to every position advanced, but to the phrase in which it was expressed. The Presidential candidate was held

closely to the text, and he made no incursions beyond it. Now the position of the candidate, as defined by himself, is of far more weight with the voters, and the letter of acceptance has come to be the legitimate creed of the party. Notoriously, little heed is given to an exposition of principles by the Committee on Resolutions, and less heed is given to resolutions when submitted to the Convention at large. This springs naturally from the fact that great haste characterizes the preparation of the platform, and if one man of the committee has any political hobby that he wishes to incorporate, he has little trouble, from the general inattention of the members, in compassing his end. Conventions often embody issues which are impracticable, and occasionally some that are mischievous and embarrassing.

Whether this mode of a full confession of faith is better than the brief style of earlier Presidential nominees, it is not necessary to determine. Probably it will be decided in each case by the topics on which the candidate desires to communicate his views. If Mr. Lincoln, in his first election, had attempted to be as frank and explicit upon the delicate and dangerous questions then before the public as later Presidential candidates have been, and to add to the platform an exposition of his own, he might have involved himself in inextricable confusion, and have lost his election by the very difficulty of expressing with advantageous brevity the position which the Republican party occupied. His letter of acceptance was short, but it said all that was safe to say:

"SPRINGFIELD, Ill., June 23, 1860.

"SIR: I accept the nomination tendered me by the convention over which you presided, of which I am formally apprised in a letter of yourself and others, acting as a committee of the convention for that purpose. The declaration of principles which accompanies your letter meets my approval, and it shall be my care not to violate it or disregard it in any part. Imploring the assistance of Divine Providence, and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the convention, to the rights of all the States and Territories and people of the nation, to the inviolability of the Constitution, and the perpetual union, prosperity, and harmony of all, I am most happy to coöperate for the practical success of the principles declared by the convention.

"Your obliged friend and fellow-citizen,

"Hon. GEORGE ASHMUN. ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

Ex-President Cleveland's letter of acceptance is not so long as President Harrison's, but it is more distinguished for differing from the platform of his party. It differs not simply in point of

explicitness and detail, but in substance of doctrine. *In fact, Mr. Cleveland has made the platform upon which he is now before the people.* The important issue of the Tariff has undergone some singular changes in the Democratic party in this canvass. A rather long resolution on the tariff, which dealt largely in argument and was mild in its conclusions, was reported by the Committee on Resolutions to the National Democratic Convention. The distinguished chairman of that committee was a member of Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet, and it was presumed that the resolutions contained the views of Mr. Cleveland himself. But no sooner were they reported in convention than they met with decided opposition, and a substitute was adopted of the most radical type, approaching more nearly to Free Trade than any Democratic National Convention had hitherto ventured.

This resolution was evidently received with disfavor by a majority of the country,—by all Republicans and by that numerous class who, though believers in the doctrine of protection, adhere to the Democratic party. Mr. Cleveland, when he met the representatives of his party at a large mass-meeting in Madison Square Garden for the purpose of receiving official notice of his nomination, made a response which showed plainly that the resolution of the Convention did not meet his views at that time. This conclusion he has made more emphatic by his letter of acceptance, an extract from which will be instructive:

"Tariff reform is still our purpose. Though we oppose the theory that tariff laws may be passed having for their object the granting of discriminating and unfair governmental aid to private ventures, we wage no exterminating war against any American interests. We believe a readjustment can be accomplished in accordance with the principles we profess without disaster or demolition. We believe that the advantages of freer raw material should be accorded to our manufacturers, and we contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens, rather than the precipitation of free trade.

"We anticipate with calmness the misrepresentation of our motives and purposes, instigated by a selfishness which seeks to hold in unrelenting grasp its unfair advantages under the present tariff laws. We will rely upon the intelligence of our fellow countrymen to reject the charge that a party comprising a majority of our people is planning the destruction or injury of American interests; and we know they cannot be frightened by the spectre of impossible free trade."

It seems hardly credible that the gentleman who alarmed the whole country, or at least the Protection part of it, by his message of 1887, could have spoken so moderately on the subject of the

Tariff, five years later. It sounds like an old Whig letter of mild Protection at a time when that party was so hard pressed by the Democracy that to assume advanced ground was to court defeat. It evinces a most gratifying advance in political science. But whether Mr. Cleveland will gain more by this advance of position than he will lose by the charge of political inconsistency sure to attend it, is a problem yet to be solved. Change of front in presence of the enemy is a dangerous movement in political as well as in military tactics. Mr. Cleveland counts certainly upon the continued support of the Free-Trade contingent of New York, and upon the large element of the same mode of thinking which has always existed in the West and Southwest. Neither of these classes, he rightly assumes, can be driven to join the Republicans, who take more decisive ground than Mr. Cleveland. But by his changed position he aims to bring to his hearty support many thousands of voters who are to-day opponents of the Free-Trade platform of his party.

The fact that Mr. Cleveland made such decisive modifications in the Free-Trade resolutions of the Convention is a great tribute on his part to the essential strength and popularity of Protective duties. It has often been said, and Mr. Cleveland apparently confirms it, that three-fourths of the country believe in Protection in some form, and are radically hostile to venturing upon a policy that aims at Free Trade.

In the paragraph relating to the currency, while attempting to make a comprehensive statement, Mr. Cleveland has evidently fallen into error. It may be quoted:

> "But whatever may be the form of the people's currency, *national or State*, whether gold, silver or paper, it should be so regulated and guarded by governmental action, or by wise and careful laws, that no one can be deluded as to the certainty and stability of its value."

If in this statement he contemplates the possibility of the currency being of a State issue, how can it be "regulated and guarded by governmental action?" How will that comport with the independence claimed for the States by the Democratic creed? And if it is to be regulated and guarded by governmental action, what need of the State having any participation in the issue of currency? If we repeal the ten per cent. tax, according to the Democratic platform, the States have the right to issue circulating notes immediately, under whatever regulations their legisla-

tures may prescribe. But the language of Mr. Cleveland implies that they are to be prevented the full liberty of issue; that they are to be restrained by "laws"—"regulated and guarded by governmental action." When the ten per cent. tax was enacted, during the war, to prevent the States from issuing currency, it was held by Secretary Chase, and generally concurred in by public men of both parties, that there was no other way of restraining the States from the power of issue. It will be observed that we do not directly restrain them. We only levy a tax which makes State issues unprofitable. The power to tax is said to be the power to destroy, and we here use it to that very end. If the government possesses the power of "regulating and guarding it by governmental action," the States could have been controlled without levying the ten per cent. tax on circulation. In fact, Mr. Cleveland gives in his adhesion to the repeal clause, and adds a provision designed to take the evil out of it, when it is all the while impossible to make that provision effective. He is self-deceived and, unintentionally no doubt, deceives others.

The truth is that some of the Southern States are bent on issuing currency, and this clause of the Democratic platform was to enable them to do it. If there be any clause entirely mischievous, any one with power to do immense harm and to do no good to the country, it is the one adopted by the Democratic National Convention on the ten per cent. tax. We cannot be mistaken in saying that Mr. Cleveland would have strengthened himself by an absolute negation of his party convention's action. But he has sought to give a gentle assent and to forestall harm by accompanying it with judicious checks which cannot be enforced. The whole mischief lies untouched and unchecked if the tax be but repealed.

A somewhat amusing conclusion of Democratic accusations has happened in the matter of National expenditures. In the first session of the Fifty-first Congress the total expenditures were nearly five hundred millions of dollars, and one is somewhat at a loss to know which cause was the most potent in the elections of that autumn, the "Billion-dollar Congress," or the McKinley tariff. *Five hundred millions of dollars* was a very high sounding sum to harp on for the expenditure of a single year; but it must be remembered that this nation is immense in area and in population, and that every part of it is making stringent efforts at

progress. Progress means additional national ability and additional national expenditure, and the aggregate amount per year is larger than that of any other nation in the world. While the Democrats were yet blowing at full note their bugle blasts of horror at Republican extravagance, it was suddenly discovered that the first session of the Fifty-second Congress, under Democratic control by a large majority, had expended more than five hundred millions, and had exceeded the appropriations of the Republicans the year before.

The amount we contribute for pensions is larger than the amount paid by any of the European nations for a standing army. Surely the binding up of the wounds of a past war is more merciful and honorable work than preparing the country for a new one. Every year the nation grows more able to pay, and when there shall be no pension roll, the country will be glad to remember that it has expended so vast a sum in payment of an honorable obligation. Great complaint has been made at various times of the amount of money paid from the National Treasury for fraudulent pensions. It cannot be possible that any party in this country wishes to shield fraud, and the gentlemen who complain so loudly should give a guise of proof to their allegations by producing, each in his own community, at least one pensioner whose name is fraudulently on the roll.

The most remarkable thing in the Presidential canvass of 1892 is the manner in which, in some sections of the country, all other issues have been put out of sight and the Force Bill alone brought into prominence. The author of this policy is Mr. Charles A. Dana, of the New York *Sun*, and it is a great tribute to his zeal and ability that such a result should have been achieved. At the beginning of the year the South, in many of the States, gave evidence of such a break in party lines, such hostility to the free-trade sentiments of the Democracy, that there was good ground for believing that its solidity would be broken, and that the Republican party might receive the electoral votes of some States in that section—notably the two Virginias, Tennessee and Alabama. The continued solidification of the South, if such a result can be accomplished, will be primarily the work of Mr. Dana alone. An old Whig, he has certain convictions on the tariff and on the currency that render it difficult, if not impossible, for him to give cordial support to the Democratic party, and he has declined,

with the powerful aid of *The Sun*, to make any other issue than the Force Bill. He found his opportunity for urging this policy, in a resolution passed by the Republican National Convention, in these words:

"We demand that every citizen of the United States shall be allowed to cast one free and unrestricted ballot in all public elections, and that such ballot shall be counted and returned as cast; that such laws shall be enacted and enforced as will secure to every citizen, be he rich or poor, native or foreign born, white or black, this sovereign right, guaranteed by the Constitution, the free and honest popular ballot, the just and equal protection under the laws as the foundation of our Republican institutions, and the party will never relax its efforts until the integrity of the ballot and the purity of elections shall be fully guaranteed and protected in every State."

It is due to candor, however, that Mr. Dana should state that the President, in his exhaustive letter of acceptance, while not repudiating the principle of honesty and fairness which underlies this resolution, takes different ground from that maintained by the Republican National Convention. It will be observed that President Harrison, after reciting the unfair practices in the South, avers that the Southern States themselves, freely, by their own action, have passed laws against unfair apportionments, and that he looks to the States for the correction of all that is complained of in the matter of elections. He suggests that he shall urge upon Congress that provision be made "for the appointment of a non-partisan commission to consider the subject of apportionments and elections in their relation to the choice of Federal officers." And he offers to urge further upon Congress the passage of a law which will give to the Supreme Court the appointment of the non-partisan Commission. Greater liberality of action, or fairer-minded treatment of a question surrounded with the gravest difficulty, could not be found. Mr. Dana should at least, with his usual impartiality, state the President's position, and should agree that if any State refuses to abide by the judgment of the non-partisan commission appointed by the Supreme Court, it should be taken as an exhibition in that State of a disposition to deal unfairly with this great question.

There is no subject with which the party of Free Trade struggles more desperately than Reciprocity. The unerring instinct of self-preservation seems to inspire a lively resentment against the name, and a truly Darwinian instinct of natural selection appears in the example chosen to prove its inutility. The narrowest

treaty of Reciprocity that was negotiated with any country was with Brazil. It is a country in which time is especially needed to change the lines of commerce. In the end, Brazil will probably show as good results, proportionally, as any other country. But at present it furnishes the least field for Reciprocity; therefore our Democratic friends, with military uniformity, lead up to Brazil to prove that the Reciprocity policy is a failure! With the wisdom of the serpent they never summon the Leeward and Windward islands, fifteen in number, Jamaica and Barbadoes, to bear testimony. Our whole dealing with those islands is in agricultural products, and the aggregate is so large that the islands consider themselves, commercially, almost a part of the United States. They take from the outside world as much as they can afford, and for agricultural products nearly every dollar that is expended comes to the United States.

But it is in the island of Cuba that Reciprocity has done the most; and no footfall of a Democratic campaigner ever disturbs the silence which hangs over Cuba when Reciprocity is under censure. No Democratic objector asks the millers of the country who send flour to Cuba, what have been the results. Statistics in the State Department show that for the first half of 1892 we sent 337,000 barrels of flour to Cuba, making for the whole year 674,000 barrels. During the same period of 1891 we sent only 14,000 barrels, or an average for the year of 28,000 barrels. Considering the small quantity we had previously sent, and that the duty was $5.75 a barrel, amounting to nearly the value of the flour delivered in Cuba, and operating, except under peculiar conditions, as a prohibition, the sagacity of Democratic silence must be conceded! A trade of $4,000,000 in flour, where we had not more than $175,000, is not a bad showing for the first year of Reciprocity.

For the year ending August 31, our total exports to Cuba were $19,700,000, and for the same period the preceding year they were $11,900,000, an increase, it will be observed, of sixty-five per cent. Another year will show still greater gains. This large increase of exports can be made more strikingly significant by a presentation of facts which must convince the most sceptical that it is due entirely to Reciprocity. An examination of Treasury statistics will show that the annual amount of exports from the United States to Cuba during the fifteen years from 1877 to 1891

did not greatly vary ; and the average for the whole period was $11,700,000 per annum. The exports for 1891 were slightly higher, therefore, than this average. The increase of $8,000,000 in 1892 represents, therefore, not only a gain of 65 per cent. over the year 1891, but a gain of 67 per cent. over the average annual amount of exports for a period of fifteen years previous. Moreover, of this gain of $8,000,000, nearly $4,000,000, as I have before said, were in flour ; and nearly $2,000,000 more were in bacon, pork, and the various articles which are classed under the head of "provisions." Three-fourths of the increased exports to Cuba were, therefore, the products of the farm. The same is true, in equal or greater ratio, of the increase caused by reciprocal treaties with the islands and countries of America, and particularly by the treaties made with European countries.

The Democratic party earned the name of being bad neighbors, violators of the Neutrality laws and disturbers of the peace, for their several attempts to take Cuba by force. Let me not be supposed to insinuate that the Government, in the hands of the Democratic party, compromised its good faith ; but the attempts upon Cuba, originating in the Southern States, were justly chargeable with being Democratic in origin. Republicans adopt Reciprocity as a more excellent way to capture it. We do Cuba great good by the lower prices at which commodities are furnished to her inhabitants ; we do ourselves great good by the profit on the trade.

It was said by William Pitt, in 1792, that he had reconquered the States by their increased commerce with the mother country ; that within eight years from the treaty of peace the republic had given more commerce to Great Britain, and exchanges were larger and more profitable, than when George III. was the ruler of America. By virtue of the Reciprocity treaty (an advantage which England, under William Pitt, did not have with the United States) we shall conquer by commerce far better than by force of arms, and gradually establish such mutual interests between Cuba and this country that commercially the two countries will be one. Already Cuba sends ninety per cent. of its products to the United States, and the Reciprocity treaty is the first attempt we have seriously or successfully made to equalize the trade by asking Cuba to take from us the larger portion of what she consumes. No Democratic speaker will venture to give these statistics, but un-

less he gives them he cannot give the true history of Reciprocity, which is that we get a valuable consideration for what would otherwise have gone on the free list without recompense or reward to us.

It will be observed, too, that we are attempting to increase our trade, by Reciprocity treaties, in the right direction. For a series of years our trade with the rest of the world has been largely in our favor. But we have annually against us so heavy a sum in Spanish America as to outweigh our balance elsewhere. If we can in any degree lessen that sum we shall save a portion of our gold coin that is retained on the other side of the Atlantic from our large exports, to pay drafts from Spanish America on citizens of the United States, made payable in London. This the Democrats have not seemed to notice, though it has been going on year after year. The Reciprocity policy is the first attempt at a change. Already the treaties negotiated have reduced our adverse West Indian and South and Central American balances to an appreciable extent. If supported and encouraged, Reciprocity will be the means of greatly lessening what has so long been an enormous balance against us in Spanish America.

The first resolution of the Democratic platform states that "the representatives of the Democratic party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, do re-affirm their allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by the long and illustrious line of successors in Democratic leadership, from Madison to Cleveland." Democrats thus seize every occasion to assume that modern Democracy was founded by Jefferson at the beginning of the century, and that all the defeats they have since received are mere interruptions of the century's flow of Jeffersonian principles, which they are especially deputed to uphold. The phantom of Jefferson appears duly in every Democratic National Convention, in every platform adopted, in every response which the candidate makes to his nomination.

It would surprise Jefferson, if he could once more appear in the flesh, to learn that he is held as indorser of all the principles and measures advocated by the Democratic party of to-day. It is perhaps not worth while to enter into any elaborate argument on the subject, but the Democracy owes no little of its success to the persistence with which its adherents have made their dis-

ciples believe this pretension through all the mutations of their party. It was equally true, it must be supposed, when Mr. Buchanan, a confirmed Federalist, was the President-elect of the Democracy; though it is well known that the object of Mr. Jefferson's most intense dislike was the Federal party. In vain is it pointed out that the position of Jefferson on any subject was directly the reverse of the Democratic position: he is duly quoted at the next convention, and a new oath of allegiance is taken to his principles. In 1801, after a severe contest, Jefferson came to the Presidency as the founder and head of the Republican party. The prefix Democratic was sometimes, though seldom, used. The tenacity with which Jefferson held to the Protective principle was only proportioned to the necessities of the country. His action in 1807, when he declined to recommend the repeal or alteration of the revenue law, after a surplus of fourteen millions had been accumulated, puts him in the sharpest contrast to Mr. Cleveland, who, in his term of office, treated the surplus accumulated as the sum of all villanies.

It is interesting and suggestive to look over the platforms of the two parties and see how much alike they are in several vital measures, after the real and divisive issues have been stated. In parallel columns they read: that the Republicans favor bi-metallism and dollars of equal value; that the Democrats favor bimetallism and dollars of equal value; both parties favor a navy, and both are in favor of building the Nicaragua Canal; both are opposed to trusts and demand more rigid laws against them; both are in favor of restricting immigration; both are hostile to Chinese immigration; both are in favor of public education, and both are hostile to any attempt at union of Church and State; both are in favor of making Congressional provision for the World's Fair; both are in favor of civil service reform; both are in favor of admitting the territories at the earliest possible moment; both sympathize with the Russian Jews; both are in favor of granting pensions; both are in favor of river and harbor improvements; both would avoid entangling alliances in our foreign policy. Out of this long platform the measures on which the parties really differ are the Tariff, Reciprocity, the tax on State banks and the Force Bill, if the Force Bill can be regarded as a party issue when so large a number of the Republican party do not favor it.

If parties would aim to discover and define those subjects on

which there is a vital difference of opinion, and would confine discussion to those issues, it would not only simplify the contest and be a welcome relief to the candidates, but would also greatly help in arriving at the truth, which is the ultimate object of popular discussion and popular election.

JAMES G. BLAINE.

THE SCANDINAVIAN IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY PROF. H. H. BOYESEN.

THE Chicago papers, at the time of the trial of the Anarchists, complimented the Scandinavians of the West on their law-abiding spirit, and the counsel for the accused emphasized the compliment by requesting that no Scandinavian should be accepted on the jury. He declared his intention to challenge any talesman of Norse blood on the mere ground of his nativity. Although this man probably had but slight acquaintance with Norsemen, the instinct which bade him beware of them was a correct one.

There is no nation in Europe that is more averse to violence, and has less sympathy with Utopian aspirations than the people of Norway and Sweden. They have been trained to industry, frugality and manly self-reliance by the free institutions and the scant resources of their native lands; and the moderation and self-restraint inherent in the cool blood of the North make them constitutionally inclined to trust in slow and orderly methods rather than swift and violent ones. They come here with no millennial expectations, doomed to bitter disappointment; but with the hope of gaining, by hard and unremitting toil, a modest competency. They demand less of life than continental immigrants of the corresponding class, and they usually, for this very reason, attain more. The instinct to save is strong in the majority of them, and save they do, when their neighbors, of less frugal habits, are running behind. The poor soil of the old land and the hardships incident upon a rough climate, have accustomed them to a struggle for existence scarcely less severe than that of the Western pioneer; and unilluminated by any hope of improved conditions in the future. The qualities of perseverance, thrift, and a sturdy sense of independence which this struggle

from generation to generation has developed are the very ones which must form the corner stone of an enduring republic.

It is therefore a fact which all students of the social problem arising from immigration have remarked, that the Scandinavians adapt themselves with great ease to American institutions. There is no other class of immigrants which is so readily assimilated, and assumes so naturally American customs and modes of thought. And this is not because their own nationality is devoid of strong characteristics, but because, on account of the ancient kinship and subsequent development, they have certain fundamental traits in common with us, and are therefore less in need of adaptation. The institutions of Norway are the most democratic in Europe, and those of Sweden, though less liberal, are developing in the same direction. Both Norsemen and Swedes are accustomed to participate in the management of their communal affairs, and to vote for their representative in the national parliament; and although the power given them here is nominally greater than that they enjoyed at home, it is virtually less. The sense of public responsibility, the habit of interest in public affairs, and a critical attitude towards the acts of government are nowhere so general among rich and poor alike as in Norway and Sweden, notwithstanding the fact that the suffrage is not universal. No great effort is therefore required, on the part of Norwegian and Swedish immigrants, to transfer their natural interest in public affairs to the affairs of their adopted country, which now must concern them closely. With increasing prosperity comes a sense of loyalty to the flag, and a disposition, perhaps, to brag in the presence of later arrivals. To be an old settler is a source of pride and is recognized as a title to consideration. A large majority of the old settlers participated in the war, and naturally shared in the sentiment of militant loyalty and devotion to the Union which animated the Federal army. This is, perhaps, the chief reason why the Scandinavian element in the United States is so overwhelmingly Republican; for the newly-arrived immigrant, having no comprehension of the questions dividing American parties, is apt to accept his politics from the respected "old settler" and veteran, and feels safe, at the end of five years, in voting as he votes. Thus it happens that the war feeling, with its attendant hostility to the South, is transmitted to those to whom the war is but a dim tradition, and the militant politics of

the veteran survives amid a peaceful generation that never smelled powder.

Another weighty reason for the loyalty of the Scandinavian to the Republican party is their hatred of the Irish.

I have heard it cited, not once but a hundred times, as a good reason for voting the Republican ticket that the Irish were all Democrats. It is no use to contradict this assertion, for the sentiment that Democracy and Irish nationality are synonymous terms is so deeply rooted in the Scandinavian agricultural population that it will require, as Sidney Smith says, a surgical operation to eradicate it. If, however, the Republicans should succeed in detaching the Irish in large numbers from their first allegiance, they must be prepared for a large defection of Scandinavian voters in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin and Illinois. The Norseman and the Celt will, I fancy, never pull together, and can scarcely be gathered into one political fold. It is a deplorable fact that such an irrational race feeling should predominate over the interests and obligations of American citizenship, but such is nevertheless the fact, and it can not be gainsaid.*

I have so far presented the brighter side of Scandinavian immigration. That the Norwegians and Swedes as a race possess the virtues which I have attributed to them, no one who knows them will deny. Their national vice, at home, is drunkenness, and many of them bring lax notions and habits with them which wreck their careers, and while they continue to cumber the earth make them a perpetual burden to their countrymen.

It is a custom in Norway, and, in fact, in every European country, to send prodigal sons, who have ceased to be pleasant company even for the swine, to the United States. Young men of the so-called better classes who have squandered their substance in riotous living, and contracted habits that make them impossible as members of any civilized society, are furnished with a ticket to New York, where their first concern is to beg the price of a ticket to Chicago and thence perhaps to St. Paul or

*It is curious to note in this connection that Tammany Hall enjoys a notoriety in Europe which no other American political organization can boast. It is held up continually in the Scandinavian press (of conservative tendencies) as a warning example, and the inevitable result of democratic government. It was undoubtedly the fact that Tammany Hall was identified with the Democratic party which made me cast my first Presidential vote for the Republican nominee for whom I had but scant admiration; it was this same dread of Tammany which made me continue to vote the Republican ticket until 1880, although I believed in the principles of the Democratic platform. I fancy my case must be typical. For nearly every immigrant I have talked with on the subject confesses to a similar experience, only with the difference that he remained a Republican.

Minneapolis. These light-hearted vagabonds who seem to think that their fate is everybody's concern but their own, have usually a very supercilious notion of America and its sordid money-worshipping inhabitants. They constitute themselves, after a brief and condescending survey of our social life and institutions, correspondents of conservative journals of Christiania, Stockholm and Copenhagen, and without having seen the inside of a single American home, unless it be that of a saloon-keeper, philosophize grandly on the lack of refinement in our manners, the lack of virtue and domesticity in our women, the lack of every redeeming feature—except that of industry and enterprise—in our whole national life. With the innocence of a new-comer they read and believe all the shocking stories of infidelity and crime in which the Sunday papers revel, and send them home as *bona fide* studies of American domestic manners. The more ludicrously exaggerated and mendacious these accounts are, the more widely they are read and sagely commented upon without reference to the worthlessness of the source from whence they proceed. A man whose opinion of his own country (which after a fashion he knows) no one would consider worth a farthing becomes, the moment he displays his insolent ignorance concerning the United States, a credible witness worthy of serious comment.

Happily, however, the prodigal constitutes a small proportion of the Scandinavian immigration, and is usually his own worst enemy. The vice of drunkenness to which many of these genteel outcasts succumb is steadily on the wane among the hardier immigrants of the West. The temperance movement has of late made great progress among both Norwegians and Swedes; their papers have taken up the subject with great vigor, and preach the gospel of abstinence with ability and eloquence. Public sentiment, which formerly looked with humorous indulgence upon the man who took a drop too much, now visits him with just condemnation. It is getting to be no longer a mark of good-fellowship to get drunk. The obvious disadvantages of inebriety in impairing a man's prosperity, and making him fall behind in the struggle for existence, are getting to be generally recognized, and are stimulating the public conscience, which formerly inclined to laxity. There is, indeed, much to be accomplished yet, but the good work is steadily and vigorously progressing.

The Scandinavians have been accused of clannishness, and not

without cause. It should, however, be considered that the immigrant, of whatever nationality, has no choice but to be clannish, unless he chooses to associate with those who look down upon him, or dispense with social intercourse altogether. Native Americans are not in the habit of welcoming the immigrant with cordiality; and they have often good reason for regarding him with eyes not altogether friendly. Social intercourse can only be agreeable among people who recognize each other as equals, and no man can be blamed for shunning the society of those who refuse to grant him this recognition. It is therefore inevitable that alien communities should grow up in our midst, as long as we permit the stream of immigration to pour unimpeded down upon our shores. Each new arrival is attracted to the locality where he has friends or kinsmen; and when he has laid aside a little money his first desire is to draw more friends and kinsmen after him. Around this nucleus a constant aggregation of homogeneous alien elements will gather.

As soon as the settlement feels itself strong enough it will send for a Norwegian Lutheran clergyman and a schoolmaster, and their presence will be a further inducement for immigrants of the same race to settle in the region. The damp, unwholesome dug-outs are displaced with neat log cabins; a rude church, which also serves for a school-house, is erected; and, without any hostile intent, every effort is made to isolate the new community from the influences of the surrounding national life. All the old customs are, as far as possible, preserved; the old Norse speech (which, however, is always corrupted by the introduction of a kind of hybrid-English terms for things that were formerly unfamiliar) is the language of church and school, and daily intercourse; and the parson, knowing that his influence will endure only so long as he can exclude American ideas, loses no opportunity to warn his flock of the dangers, both temporal and eternal, which threaten him who goes in search of strange gods. When, now and then, a youth breaks away, which indeed is constantly happening, lured by the prizes of ambition in the great cities, he is spoken of as one who has imperilled his soul's salvation for the glittering treasure of this world. I have known Norwegian clergymen who have spent twenty or thirty years in the United States, and at the end of that time scarcely acquired any more knowledge of American life than they would have had if they had

stayed quietly at home. Superficial half-truths and shallow generalization, based upon prejudice and undigested facts, they had indeed collected in abundance ; but the point of view remained stubbornly hostile and alien, and their conclusions worthy of the writer of American editorials in the *Saturday Review*.

What I have here said refers, of course, only to country communities. In the great cities Scandinavians, though they have their own musical, athletic, and social organizations, are brought into such intimate contact with American life, that, as a rule, they become rapidly Americanized. In Chicago, where they number in the neighborhood of 150,000 to 175,000 ; in Minneapolis, where their number is somewhat less; in St. Paul, where in 1884 they claimed 30,000 to 40,000, they naturally play a considerable rôle in politics, and would play a far greater one if they were not so addicted to jealousies and internal dissensions. The Norwegians are jealous of the Swedes ; the Swedes of the Norwegians ; and the Danes of both. If a Swede runs for office, he can rarely count on Norwegian support, unless, perhaps, a special bargain has been struck, pledging Swedish support to a Norwegian candidate on the same ticket. But the difficulties of such a "deal" are almost insurmountable.

There is continual complaint in the Scandinavian papers of the West that the nationalities which they represent are not recognized in the distribution of offices ; and it is alleged that in cities and counties, where the Scandinavians twice outnumber the Irish, the latter have a larger representation in municipal and county offices. The reason of this is not a lack of aptitude for public affairs on the part of Norwegians and Swedes ; for, on the contrary, they take as naturally to politics as goslings do to water. But it is rather because they have not learned to suspend personal spites and resentments for the sake of a larger end to be gained. They have not learned party discipline nor the faculty to assert themselves as a unit. From the American point of view, this is perhaps not a matter of regret, but rather of congratulation. For we have already a pestiferous abundance of alien nationalities which have the insolence to claim recognition, not as bodies of American citizens, but as Irish, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles ; as if in that capacity they had any right to participation in the government of the American republic.

The Scandinavian immigration to this country has its roman-

tic tradition, which would furnish material for an epic. The Swedes, as is well known, settled in Delaware and New Jersey during the reign of Gustavus Adolphus and his daughter Christina, and mingled their blood, in a slight proportion, with that of the original three million Americans who engaged in the Revolution. The beginning of the immigration from Norway is of much more recent date. A Quaker, named Kleng Peerson, who had suffered persecution on account of his faith, gathered, in 1825, a number of his co-religionists and some besides who were not Quakers, and set sail for New York. The company, which consisted of fifty-two persons, bought a small sloop, which they loaded with a cargo of iron. After a perilous adventure on the coast of England they must have lost their reckoning, or the skipper must have been ignorant of navigation, for when next we hear of them they have drifted as far south as the island of Madeira, where they found a cask of good wine floating in the sea. To celebrate this piece of good fortune, the captain, the crew, and some of the passengers got drunk, and the ship drifted without colors or command into the harbor of Madeira. Here it was supposed that they had yellow fever or some other pestilence on board, and as no response was made to signals from the fortress, orders were given to fire upon the sloop. The cannon were just being aimed, when one of the sober passengers managed to run up the Norwegian flag and the danger was averted.

In New York, where the company landed after a voyage of fourteen weeks, their arrival excited quite a sensation, for it was unheard of in those days to cross the Atlantic in so small a craft. The majority of the immigrants settled in Morris County, near the city of Rochester, where they had to pay five dollars per acre for forest land. After many tribulations and hardships they began at length to prosper, and by their letters home induced others to join them. Quite a number of Norwegians emigrated, singly and in small companies, between 1825 and 1836; but it was not until the latter year that a second Norwegian settlement was planted in the United States. This time the settlers chose the Fox River region, in Illinois, which Kleng Peerson had selected for them. This man, who was the leader and pioneer of the Norwegian migration, foresaw the future development of this great and fertile continent, and was desirous that his own people should share in the making of the nation, which was to profit by the vastness of its resources.

It is notable that, though in many of the earliest Norse settlements the descendants of the first settlers are still living, there is very little but their names (often Anglicized) and a certain Norwegian cast of features to indicate their Scandinavian origin. They speak English, and, if they have ever learned Norwegian, have usually forgotten it. They have intermarried with American families, and live, think, and feel as Americans. I have had letters from many of these people, asking me to suggest Norwegian names for their children, or inquiring about certain localities in Norway from which their parents or grandparents came. It would seem, judging by the rapidity with which they have adopted American speech and modes of life, that the problem of the assimilation of the immigrant may be safely left to time, without the interference of artificial agencies. But it must be remembered that, fifty or sixty years ago, the Scandinavian nationalities were completely lost in the ocean of American life, which beat upon them on all sides, and they had no choice but to drift with the current. I am far from believing now that they, or any other nationality, are strong enough to remain permanently alien in our midst ; but they are surely able to resist, for a whole generation, the influence of our national life, and make the process of national assimilation extremely difficult for their children.

How stubborn a foreign people may be in adhering from generation to generation to inherited customs, habits, and speech, is strikingly demonstrated by the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch, who, after the lapse of a hundred years, speak a German dialect. The Dutch settlements in Wisconsin and those of the Mennonites of Pennsylvania and Ohio, though of more recent origin, have succeeded as completely in preserving their alien identity ; and the Norwegians in Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin have only succeeded less completely, because they are a more ambitious and enterprising race, and in the second generation are drawn by their ambition into the vortex of political and commercial competition. Nevertheless, I cannot help believing that a great deal of valuable energy is lost or misdirected by the policy of exclusion, which keeps a settlement, at least for a generation, apart from the national life and retards the Americanization of the immigrant.

The system of parochial schools, too, which the Scandinavian Lutheran churches are endeavoring to establish, is directly hostile to the settler's best interests, being intended as a bulwark

(and a most effective one) against the incoming tide of Americanism. For the public schools, with all their defects, have always served as a hopper into which all the mixed alien grain is poured, to be ground into flour, the general quality of which is American. Parochial schools, in which the teachers are of the children's own nationality and the text-books sometimes in foreign tongues and always foreign in tone and sentiment, can never perform this service, and are usually founded for the very purpose of perpetuating alienism and preventing the children of immigrants from becoming absorbed in the dominant nationality.

As the latest available statistics regarding the numbers and distribution of Scandinavians in the United States are those of the census of 1880, an estimate of their present strength must of necessity be more or less conjectural. Immigration has been subject to continual fluctuations since 1880, and reached its maximum in 1882 when the total number of aliens landed on our shores was 788,992, of whom 87,610 were natives of Norway and Sweden. The average since then has fallen below half a million, of whom Norway and Sweden have furnished from 30,000 to 60,000. The total Scandinavian population of this country (counting only actual immigrants) was, in 1880, 440,262. The number of arrivals during the last twelve years has aggregated above 400,000, and, making allowance for the death rate, it is probably fair to estimate the total at about 750,000. This figure is, however, wholly inadequate to represent the real Scandinavian element in our population. For the children and grandchildren of Norsemen, Swedes and Danes, though they may be American in sentiment, are yet ethnologically Scandinavians, and contribute Scandinavian characteristics to our composite nationality.

Mr. Albert Shaw, in an article in one of our magazines, estimated the total Scandinavian population of the United States, including descendants in the first generation, at 1,800,000, of whom upwards of 900,000 were born in Norway, Sweden and Denmark. I am inclined to believe that this estimate was somewhat too liberal five years ago, but the census of 1890, if it takes account of first descendants, will not fall much below that figure. Mr. Shaw's distribution of Scandinavians between the different States and territories is also, according to my judgment, fairly correct; "Minnesota," he says, "has not less than 400,000 people of Scandinavian descent. Wisconsin has from 225,000 to 300,000. The two

Dakotas may be credited with fully 150,000 or more." All these estimates were made five or six years ago, and will no doubt be much modified by the next census bulletin dealing with distribution of population according to nationality.

That the Scandinavians are learning to assert themselves in politics is shown by the fact that they had three representatives in the Fiftieth Congress, viz.: The Hon. Knute Nelson, of the fifth Minnesota district, who is the present Republican nominee for Governor; the Hon. John Lind, a Swede, of the second, and the Hon. Nels P. Haugan, of the eighth Wisconsin district. Mr. Nelson declined renomination to the Fifty-first Congress, which contains besides Messrs. Lind and Haugan, the Republican M. N. Johnson, of North Dakota, and a member of the Farmers' Alliance named Kittel Halvorsen. State and county offices of Minnesota and Wisconsin have also to a large extent been filled with men of Norse and Swedish blood. President Cleveland was the first to honor a Norseman with a diplomatic office, appointing Prof. R. B. Anderson, of Wisconsin, Minister to Denmark.

The process of assimilation of the heterogeneous foreign elements which now constitute our population is similar to that which went on in England from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. During that period the Saxon, the Norseman, the Dane, and the Celt were gradually transformed into Englishmen. Race animosities were rife; Saxon and Norman hated each other as long as each could be plainly distinguished as native or alien. The same confusion and strife, though mitigated by the influences of a later civilization, may be looked for here, while we have to grind alien grain in the national hopper. But the more homogeneous nationalty, which in time will issue forth, will, I doubt not, justify the turmoil and noise and discomfort of the grinding, and the elements, physical and mental, which the Scandinavians will contribute to this final product will surely not be the least valuable.

HJALMAR HJORTH BOYESEN.

POLITICS AND THE PULPIT.

BY BISHOP CYRUS D. FOSS, D. D., LL. D., OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE proper relation of Christian ministers to political questions cannot be determined without a rapid preliminary glance at both the conspicuous successes and the conspicuous failures of Christianity. The consideration of Christianity in either of these aspects, entirely apart from the other, is totally misleading and may land the careless observer either in reckless optimism or in hopeless pessimism. *Facts* can be gathered and marshalled so as to show that the Millenial glory is just about to burst over all the earth; and counter *facts* can be made to show that the historian of to-morrow will probably have to record the "Decline and Fall" of Christianity. There must be sober balance and honest perspective.

An English poet, glancing back over the weary centuries which have elapsed since the proclamation of "glad tidings of great joy unto all people," and then around upon the restless, sin-cursed globe, sadly sings :—

> "We have preached Christ for centuries,
> Until, at last, men learn to scoff,
> So few seem any better off."

A poet-divine shall answer this pessimistic singer. Canon Farrar says :

"Let not such notes of distress blind us to what is still a splendid reality. The abolition of slavery among Christian nations; the extinction of gladiatorial games and the cruel shows of the amphitheatre; war rendered more merciful; womanhood honored and elevated; childhood surrounded with an aureole of tenderness and embraced in the arms of mercy; education extended; marriage sanctified; the bonds of serfdom broken; hospitals built; the eternal and inalienable rights of man everywhere asserted; pity for the prisoners; compassion even to the animal world; the gospel

preached to the poor—these are some of the *Gesta Christi*, some of the triumphs of Christianity. These belong not only to its ideal, but also in large measure to its achievements."

Yet, it must be sadly confessed, there are other facts just as solid which may well blanch the cheeks of the bravest. Terrific forces of evil menace Christianity and even society itself. The festering masses of vice and crime in our large cities, growing in bigness and badness every decade; the enormous increase of wealth, for the most part totally indifferent to the claims of poverty, and often recklessly defiant of them; shameless political corruption in the shadow of hundreds of church steeples; the steady and rapid growth of socialism tinged with anarchism and hurling dynamite; the seeming failure of the long-continued efforts of the multitudes of good men and women to make head against the awful evil of the drink curse; and the steady, forward march of the saloon power, corrupting legislatures, buying courts, and debauching politics; these and other allied forces of evil show the need of re-forming the lines of Christianity so that it shall face the foe. We cannot afford to be flanked or struck in the rear.

The Christian forces must change front and look their worst enemies straight in the eye. The brief roster just now given of some of those enemies strongly suggests that the work of the Church must be (in a proper sense of the word) increasingly *political*. So also, of course, the work of the ministry. For the ministry is historically and logically the leader of the Church. First the ministry, then the Church. This is the divine order. To his apostles the Lord said, "Go ye, disciple all nations."

It is indeed a great glory of the world's Redeemer that he was "the discoverer of the individual man." Before He revealed man to Himself and to His fellow man the individual existed chiefly for the State. Man as man was insignificant; history concerned itself with man as strong, brilliant, victorious, great. One man, the plague and curse of the world, might grind millions under his chariot wheels on his bloody track to the imperial purple, and then be apotheosized. It was a radically new view of humanity which revealed the King of All Worlds as having "tasted death for every man," a view which immensely levelled up the lowest of men.

The Man of Nazareth is, however, not only the Friend of

Man, the brother of the most abject, the helper of the individual to bear his burdens and rise step by step, and the atoning sacrifice for each lost soul. He is also "the King of kings and Lord of lords." He came to set up a kingdom which is to permeate, subjugate and dominate all the governments of the whole earth. Prophecy abounds in representations of him as "A Man of War." He is the sworn foe of all unrighteousness in governments. He is to "have dominion from sea to sea." "All kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him." It would have been strange, indeed, if in this world-subjugating war the lieutenants had not been called to imitate their Leader. He was the supreme model of indignant rebuke of sin in high places. Human speech reached its climax of invective and excoriation on His holy lips. It was to eminently respectable rulers that He said: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" It was in sending a message to a king that He said, "Go tell that fox." Ages before His visible appearance He inspired His prophets to intermeddle in politics. A divine alarum sounded in their ears: "Cry aloud, spare not." Many a time they were specially commissioned to charge kings face to face, and also whole communities, with high-handed rebellion against God.

We are thus led to one of the chief functions of the Christian ministry; it must incarnate and voice the best conscience of the age, not shrinking when the sins to be denounced are intrenched behind political barricades; nay, holding up the sins of rulers to the most merciless rebuke because of their far-reaching and signally destructive influence. The duty of a minister to defend truth and justice is not at all mollified but rather intensified by the circumstance that the awful form of a resistless tyrant confronts him, or that sundry millions of his fellow-creatures are induced by demagogues to try to make evil good by their ballots. An inward voice from which there is no appeal requires him to "obey God rather than men," and to persuade all he can to join him in such obedience. The smile of God is mightier than the tyrant's frown. History furnishes inspiring examples; such as Elijah before Ahab, John the Baptist before Herod, Ignatius before Trajan, Ambrose before Theodosius, Luther before Charles V. Creasy writes of "The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World:" these duels did more for freedom and for man than

some of those battles. The world has seen many a crisis—hours in which the great want of a nation, a cause, or an idea has been a clarion voice to crystallize and vitalize the best thought and purpose of the age. Such a voice can proceed only from a man with the eye of a seer and the heart of a Hebrew prophet, a man living fifty years ahead of his time and fearing God only.

In view of such incontestable principles and of the conspicuous examples by which they have been illustrated in every age, it is strange, indeed, how widespread and persistent the notion is that politics and religion may of right be entirely dissevered from each other,—that they necessarily occupy different territories of human thought and life. "Do you suppose I mingle my religion with my politics?" replied a man of standing in his church to a gentleman who had taken him to task for political conduct, inconsistent with his religious profession. Especially has it been held that the Christian ministry should be blandly blind to the strifes of political parties, and that the pulpit should reserve all the vials of its wrath for the sins of the Patagonians. Political papers have solemnly warned the ministry to "preach the gospel" and to "let politics alone."

No doubt it is wise for a minister to be every man's friend, so far as he can be, with no least sacrifice of principle. It is his duty like Paul to become "all things to all men, so that by all means he may save some." He must at times sacrifice taste, preference, ease, convenience—anything but conscience, to do men good. He is most unwise if he bar his way to usefulness by turning his pulpit into a political hustings. The mere contests of party politics, which involve no grave moral issues, have no place there. Above all it is not his function to attempt to direct, from that throne of influence, the party affiliations of his people. That is a question for the individual himself. No man and no organization may invade the sacred realm of private judgment. Far distant be the day, in this free republic, when any hierarchy shall undertake to deliver votes by the ten thousand. No church could possibly assume a prerogative more hateful and menacing to our most cherished institutions. The sentiment of the Protestant churches in general is correctly voiced by the utterance on this subject made by the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church last May to the quadrennial General Conference of the Church assembled in Omaha.

"With regard to politics, the attitude of our Church is strenuously non-partisan and non-sectional. It acknowledges no allegiance to any political creed or association. It urges all its members who have the right to vote to discharge that duty, but it leaves every voter absolutely free from ecclesiastical interference to determine for himself for whom his ballot shall be cast. The right of suffrage, or the franchise, we regard as a great and responsible trust, which should in all cases, ecclesiastical and civil, be exercised conscientiously, but in absolute personal freedom."

The high duty previously set forth of moral censorship of political measures and of individual rebuke of wicked rulers may seem at a glance inconsistent with this strenuous assertion of personal political independence. It does not appear so to the Church of which I have just spoken. For many years that Church, with fifteen thousand ministers and over two million members, has flung to the breeze a banner inscribed "Total Abstinence and Legal Prohibition." In the same episcopal address above quoted its bishops say:

"We hold with unabated tenacity to the oft-repeated statement that total abstinence is the only safety for the individual, and that complete legal prohibition of the traffic is the urgent duty of the State. We rejoice in every step of progress towards the attainment of these ends. In our judgment the saloon is an unmixed evil, full of diabolism, a disgrace to our civilization, the chief corrupter of political action, and a continued menace to the order of society and to the peace and purity of our homes. We exhort all our people to encourage every repression and limitation of the business, and to keep a steady eye to its total extirpation."

And its General Conference, its only law-making body, declared, "We do not presume to dictate the political conduct of our people, but we do record our deliberate judgment that no political party has a right to expect, nor ought it to receive, the support of Christian men so long as it stands committed to the license policy, or refuses to put itself on record in an attitude of open hostility to the saloon." This last declaration was also adopted, with slight verbal changes, by the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

These well-considered deliverances of the picked ministers and laymen of two of the most influential branches of the Church in America show the attitude they feel bound in conscience to hold towards an immense moral evil whose defenders perpetually thrust it into politics to be sanctioned and guarded, and which neither of the great political parties dares attack. Good men must hate it; the pulpit must thunder against it—all the more because so many politicians, finding it an inconvenient factor in

their calculations about party successes, try to laugh it out of the way as a trifle; as, for example, Mr. Turpin, who is reported to have said in his place in Congress that the attitude of Iowa towards the drink traffic is a "transient fanaticism," "a local, temporary frenzy," and to have added, "with respect to this shadowy, thin, transparent, gauzy essence, or image of an essence, that is called 'the moral sentiment behind prohibitory legislation,' I do not believe that we have the denomination of coin made small enough to measure its value."

Half a century ago there was abroad in the country another "moral sentiment," very inconvenient to politicians, greatly derided but terribly persistent. For many a decade it had asserted itself sporadically, sometimes aimlessly, sometimes most unwisely; but it was rooted in conscience and it grew. Great statesmen decreed its destruction, great parties built adamant walls in the track of its progress; but statesmen and parties went down before its resistless march. It gave birth to Garrison and Phillips and John Brown, to "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and Whittier and Lowell, to Abraham Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation. The "impossible" became actual; slavery died. All this came from the growth of a "moral sentiment." One of the mightiest of the forces which helped to save, to free and to unify the nation was the aroused conscience of the Christian Church. That sublime awakening seemed to the early abolitionists guiltily slow and late. Wendell Phillips, with superb scorn, once said, at an old-time anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the Broadway Tabernacle, "The church! the church!—if all the churches on this continent had been sunk into the earth forty years ago, the cause of freedom would have been further forward." But that greater "man of the people," raised up from the ranks of the people to make possible the continued existence of "a government of the people by the people, for the people," knew where his strength lay; and, in the pinch of the nation's sorest need, said: "Blessed be God who in our great trial giveth us the churches." In those awful days many a pulpit resounded with such texts as this: "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, beat your plow-shares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears." Myriads of the "boys in blue" went forth from Christian altars fortified by the benediction of godly pastors and inspired by the knowledge that they were

remembered every Sabbath in the prayers of thousands of churches and every day in the supplications of millions of homes. The songs of the Sunday-school resounded beside many a camp-fire. Many a soldier felt the New Testament he carried to be either a shield against bullets or a key to heaven. "The brains behind the bayonets" have perhaps been glorified too much; the consciences behind the bayonets, too little. Ten righteous men might have saved Sodom; millions of righteous men with God's blessing did save America. The Church is the salt of the nations.

Republican institutions on this continent, where their past achievements have filled the world with admiring wonder, are now confronted and menaced by two great and growing evils, both of which require the presence of the pulpit in the political arena; the enormous aud unblushing corruption of many of our municipal governments, and the frightful and widening chasm between the rich and the poor, or, rather, between manual laborers and their employers. Both these evils are largely augmented by the perpetual inflow of a vast immigration, which brings to our shores not only various elements of strength, but also the very scum and poisonous off-scouring of the seething civilizations of the old world—paupers, criminals, agnostics, nihilists and anarchists. To cope with these forces of evil the progress of society must henceforth be largely on political lines. Some recent events make us wonder how nearly right Horace Bushnell may have been in preaching a sermon on "Barbarism, the first danger." The individual cannot maintain his own rights. The attempt to do this was the fault of the Carnegie Company on that day of carnage at Homestead. The State must be the defender of the individual, and must provide the conditions for his best development. Yet Bellamyism is a delusion. The "paternal government" idea easily runs into visionary schemes which are totally impracticable and subversive of individual rights. The State must itself become righteous by the omnipresence and omnipotence of moral principle. How can it be expected that loafers, swindlers, whiskey-guzzlers, and public thieves should make or execute just laws? The mission of the gospel is to society; to senates, and parliaments as well as to individuals. "Public virtue" must become more than a meaningless phrase.

Municipal misgovernment has long had signal illustration

in the metropolis of the country. New York is ruled by a society which is "not so much a political party as it is a corporation, organized in the interest of making the most possible out of its official opportunities." Many public officers elected by it have, with moderate salaries, quickly become millionaires. Now and then the outraged people, in some brief spasm of indignation, have hurled a Tweed into prison, or have obliged a Connolly to fly to the ends of the earth; have elected an honest mayor and secured a temporary reform in some one department. But a sewer is a filthy place; good men grow weary and declare "politics a dirty business;" the forces of plunder and vice rally, close ranks, and walk the deck again as though nothing had happened; and nothing much *has* happened.

What needs to happen is that all men who really want good government shall make themselves felt all the way from the primary to the ballot-box with a persistence like that of the law of gravitation. A keen student of politics says:

"The doctrine that politics is the broadest, richest, and most important field of Christian endeavor will probably seem to many a startling proposition; but it is one on the truth of which the future, not only of republican government, but of Christian civilization, depends. Neither of these can be regarded as secure until it is accepted as a principle of Christian ethics that a man can no more stand idly by and see public evils prevail and expect to be held guiltless, than if he were a willing witness of his brother's murder. . . . The neglect of political duty by good men is the chief source of all suffering from misgovernment by bad men."

Pre-eminently is it the function of the church and of the pulpit in this age to mediate between capital and labor, and with ceaseless assiduity to fill in the awful chasm between wealth and poverty. The rapid accumulation of enormous wealth in the hands of a few, the fruit of the ill-requited toil of the many, and the grinding and soulless arrogance of some monopolies, which raise the price of the necessaries of life in order to multiply fortunes already colossal; and over against these the general, fomented, bitter and increasing discontent among the poor, are patent and alarming facts.

Beyond the sea these evils have existed longer and developed more fully; so we may wisely look there for helpful object lessons. Mr. Gladstone says that the total income of the United Kingdom has trebled in forty-nine years, that "the clutch and gripe of most possessors over their money is scarcely ever relaxed," and that

their "incomes are swallowed up without compunction in the insatiable maw of their desires." Another English voice of equal authority declares that "the vaunted charities of England, when estimated by the certain wealth of England, are not the glory of our national generosity, but the most damning proof of the national meanness and national indifference." Set over against these facts General Booth's picture of "the submerged tenth" of the population of England, living below "the cab-horse standard" of work, food and shelter.

On this continent like causes are swiftly working out like results. Our nation's hope is in general education, the purification of politics, the destruction of the drink-traffic, wise legislation, and the absolute and omnipresent supremacy of law; and, above all, in the evangelization of the masses of the people. The Incomparable Teacher gave the one panacea for the ills of "all nations" in six words: "Preach the gospel to every creature."

Recent events justify a most emphatic final word of practical suggestion to all public teachers with tongue or pen, based on Chatham's great utterance, "Where law ends, tyranny begins." There is no tyranny so abominable as that of the riotous multitude. Better Nero than a mob. No amount of sincerest sympathy for the toiling masses should close our eyes to the majesty of the law and the sacredness of individual right. Murder is murder. Vipers from Europe are among us; they hiss and crawl and bite. "The America of Lincoln and of Garfield must learn to hate the misshapen broods of Atheism and Nihilism with a hatred deadlier even than that of the England of their fathers against Popery and Spain. Execrable was the Inquisition, but the Inqusition was holy compared to that raging hatred of God and man, that deification of lust and blood, which, adopting the enginery of devils, preaches the hell-born gospel of petroleum and of dynamite. The day has come when the nations must look this devil in the face."

CYRUS D. FOSS.

WHAT CHOLERA COSTS COMMERCE.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

THE conviction seems painfully prevalent in many intelligent quarters that next year will witness cholera as an epidemic in the United States. The fear is entertained more as a supposition than as a positive thing, and if the expectation were universal it would make it none the more certain of fulfilment. Thus far no disease has yielded more readily than has cholera to preventive measures, and the control in the past few weeks which has so completely checked its introduction into this continent is a singular and comforting illustration of what is likely to occur in the future.

But the argument is urged that the germs of the dread disease will by next year be far more generally distributed in Europe than has yet been the case this year. The imagination runs away with the idea that these germs, still possessing the potentiality of disease, will imperceptibly find their way hither, in articles of merchandise, as in rags, hides, cloth, needlework, fine wools, toys, and especially in clothing, of all which there is constantly a large importation from the continent. The expectation that living particles of disease will last for months, imbedded in articles of merchandise, seems unreasonable. When it is recalled that cholera is not contagious, even such a possibility as the importation of live germs lessens the chances enormously, for as it is only infectious, it can only be prevalent where the greatest carelessness exists, even if introduced. As compared with what has occurred in New York harbor in the past few weeks, it would seem impossible to encounter greater danger, or to have a class of circumstances more adverse with which to cope. Yet through the exceedingly able administration of Dr. Jenkins, the State Health Officer, and his devoted staff of assistants, the dis-

ease has been effectually stamped out, for the time being. Nothing worse may now be expected to occur than did occur in having, literally, thousands of the worst class of emigrants from infected ports confined to the narrowest quarters of a ship, in almost personal contact with hundreds of cabin passengers, with hardly a single case of cholera occurring among the latter. On the other hand, just so soon as the authorities got possession of the living cargoes of filthy humanity, among whom the disease was raging, the casualties were reduced to a minimum. Indeed the whole history of the noble struggle in the Lower Bay of New York, by the authorities, under the firm grasp of Dr. Jenkins, shows how effectually the dread disease can be stamped out, and ought to bring assurance that, so far as the future is concerned, there is little to fear.

But in order that the public mind may be aroused to the necessity of taking every possible precaution, it may be well to set forth briefly what might possibly be the consequences to the commerce of the country should cholera find a lodgement in any of the great cities, or become epidemic, as it once before did, in small towns. The actual ascertainable loss involved and the monetary disaster that would follow are so palpable and enormous that it would seem as if there was hardly any precaution which should not be taken by the authorities, either Federal, State or Municipal. Justification for the most extreme measures will be found in the contemplation of the magnitude of the disaster that would occur, if the business of the country were to be seriously interfered with, even by good ground for apprehension, apart from the actual existence of the disease in any considerable number of places.

Perhaps a measure of damage to the transportation interests of the country might be found in what has already occurred to the great line of steamships hailing from ports affected. It would be difficult to imagine a greater calamity than, for instance, has occurred to the Hamburg line of steamers, so splendidly equipped, and gaining so rapidly in favor by their ability, large investment, and magnificent craft. It is true that other lines have escaped the vast loss experienced by this special corporation, and that by the patronage of Americans intent upon reaching home, in order to escape the possibilities of cholera in Europe, the receipts have been fairly maintained thus far in the season. But beyond all question, the earning power of every steamship company for the

balance of the year, and certainly for next year, from both sides, has been seriously affected. It will be no exaggeration to believe that the gross receipts of the European steamship companies will be cut down at least one-third from what they would be if normal conditions existed. Unless perhaps the tide of travel next year towards the Columbian Exhibition swells the income, the losses of the European lines will certainly reach the above estimate.

If the losses to the ocean-going lines are taken as a measure of the losses possible by cholera to the land transportation interests, should cholera become epidemic in the United States, some idea may be formed of the enormous disaster that would overtake the country. If, for instance, travel should lessen, say, twenty-five per cent., and the freight traffic diminish fifteen to twenty per cent., the railroads and steamship lines of the country would be most adversely affected. Yet such a contingency is not a remote one, if a universal fear took possession of the people. The desire to stay at home as the safest of places, the anxiety to avoid exposure and contact with others, the fear of change in water and in food prepared by strangers, would be universal, and it would be no exaggeration to believe that fully one-quarter of those who habitually travel would cease to do so. Indeed that proportion would be a small one to be thus affected, for the number of buyers, sellers, speculators and tourists that can suddenly cease to travel, is in far larger ratio to the travelling public than is generally supposed. As to the question of freight and expressage affected by the presence of cholera, the estimate must be extremely vague. But if speculation were paralyzed, as it would be, and shipments restricted to the actual necessities of life, it will be at once realized how enormous the reduction in transportation would be.

If the receipts of transportation were to be cut down twenty-five per cent., a financial disaster would occur of the first magnitude. As a rule the surplus over operating expenses of average transportation facilities do not exceed twenty-five per cent., and it is with this surplus that interest, fixed charges and dividends are paid. If these were to stop, the extent of the calamity would be next to universal. Following this, however, would be the result that the entire monetary circles of the country would be most seriously affected. Not only would speculation be paralyzed and all new enterprises be checked, but even for the legitimate wants of business, the monetary accommodation would be wanting.

The loss of confidence would restrict loans, lessen deposits, and generally contract the policy of every financial institution in the country. The result would be an almost total cessation of new purchases; and credit, that blessed hand-maid of commerce, would receive so severe a shock as to be for the moment almost beyond recovery. The results of this would be, that the earning power of banking institutions throughout the land would almost cease, and in connection with the investments in railroads and steamboat lines, there would be a cessation of revenue, almost universal, among the class dependent upon dividend returns. The income of capitalists would thus largely sink out of sight, and with this also the ability to buy and pay for the articles, the sale of which yields a profit for the great rank and file of retailers, who supply the wants of those whose incomes are steady and liberal. These retailers, in their turn, would be unable to pay their obligations, much less to make new purchases, and would be seriously embarrassed, their employees and their families all sharing in the general disaster.

It is true that the wants of the people would of necessity create a great exchange, and that production in manufacturing, agriculture and mining would go forward. But all these would of necessity be greatly restricted by the want of confidence, the lack of money and, the general limitation of demand that would unanimously prevail. Even in country localities, in small villages, made up of small stores, the group that includes the blacksmith, the shoemaker, the carpenter, the saddler, the cabinet maker, etc., would be affected, and the result would seem to be universal in the shape of adverse conditions, should the presence or the scare from cholera be prevalent.

As to the effect upon the great exhibition at Chicago, should there be present in this country even slight signs of cholera, its consequences, it will be readily seen, will be most damaging. The investment made in preparation, at Chicago itself, for this great event in the history of the new world, is sufficient to call for the most extraordinary measures for protection. But added to this is an enormous sum, in almost every part of the country, in the shape of expenditure for exhibits, while the preparation by the railroads and transportation lines, in anticipation of a great traffic, would swell the sum to enormous proportions. All this is at risk, in addition to the ordinary chances of loss, while the profit possi-

ble to be realized and the advantage to be gained by the success of the Fair, which would be interfered with by cholera, is almost beyond estimate.

A survey, therefore, of all the interests likely to be affected, discloses a disaster of so great a magnitude as to call forth the very best possible efforts to prevent the introduction of cholera into the country. The events of the past few weeks in the harbor of New York, dramatic in their incidents, and so full of danger to the public welfare, will not have been in vain in the shape of an object lesson, if from that lesson be learned the absolute necessity for the most ample precaution, and the most liberal provision with which to avoid the approach of the pestilence. The justification for any measures, however extreme, seems to be found in these occurrences, equally with the possibilities that would flow from the introduction of the disease into this country. Perhaps no event could occur which would more vividly illustrate the necessity for a reform in the matter of immigration. The steady stream of humanity which has set in the direction of these shores has of late years perceptibly declined in desirability, increased in danger, and lessened in its claims to consideration. If it were decided by Congress that no more immigration should be permitted within the next twelve months, the action would seem to be almost justified by the danger that is incurred. The country would in a certain sense be the loser to the extent of the many millions which immigration is supposed to be worth. But, on the other hand, it would be the gainer by permitting its own people to do the work at remunerative prices, which these immigrants now do at starvation figures. The safety in the matter of health would be enormously promoted by the total cessation of immigration, though a step so radical could hardly be advocated. Nevertheless, the country at large would approve of a policy so sweeping as to effectually protect the health of the whole body, by ceasing to expose it to these foreign introductions.

It will not be necessary, however, to go to such an extent; but most thorough and exhaustive methods should be adopted in ports of departure for cleanliness and selection of immigration, and the heartiest coöperation of the various transportation companies should be obtained, by force if necessary, to limit the arrivals, not only to those who are desirable, but of those whose health, cleanliness, and antecedents are ascertained.

Precautions of an extraordinary nature should also be taken as to importations, and consular certificates should only be granted to well-established firms, which should be held responsible for the character of the goods shipped. It may be difficult to amplify and enforce rigid regulations of this character, but as will be seen by the extent of the disaster which threatens, and the enormous loss that might follow, there is hardly any precaution which could be taken by legislation or governmental interference which should not be made available during the coming year. There is happily less to fear, with watchfulness on all sides, than ever before. It is believed that there are numerous diseases in the country that are far more dangerous than cholera, yet the country survives these, and if but the same watchfulness and carefulness is exercised by the authorities of every municipality, every State, and the nation at large, the United States continue as free from this dreaded disease as it has hitherto been.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

THE DEMOCRATIC OUTLOOK.

BY THE HON. W. F. HARRITY, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

ANY prediction as to the result of a Presidential election, made a month in advance of the day of decision, is unsatisfactory, for it necessarily excludes the possible and unforeseen contingencies of the interim, as well as the results of efficient organization. Elections have been lost and won in much less time. This is especially true of our country; for not only has it the largest electorate of any popular government, but its voters, who will this year exceed 12,000,000 in number, are more evenly divided than those of other countries. It will, therefore, require a very small percentage of change to convert a minority into a majority.

Thus, since 1876, no candidate for the Presidency has polled a majority of the votes, notwithstanding the absence of any considerable third party. The pluralities have been small. In 1880, Garfield had 7,018; Cleveland in 1884, 62,683, and in 1888, 98,017.

Another fact that increases the difficulty of successful prediction is that our great increase of voters is not wholly due to the natural increase of population, owing to the disproportion of births to deaths; but is also caused by extensive immigration, made up of many thousand men of different nationalities, races, and political prepossessions.

It is true that an approximate estimate of results is somewhat simplified by our electoral system, which, in preceding elections, has caused the final decision to depend upon the voice of not more than five States. Thoughtful men, however, will concur in the opinion that this is less true of the present election than heretofore. The number of debatable States has increased, and

west, as well as east, of the Mississippi the storm centres will be found.

To these considerations, which make present prediction exceptionally conjectural and uncertain, must be added the further fact that we are living in a period of political transition. The epoch of the war and reconstruction, with its intense feelings and rooted convictions, has passed away. New leaders and new issues are the significant signs of the change. The latter are economic rather than emotional; and voters are less settled in conviction, and therefore less demonstrative in opinion.

The present calm, amounting to seeming apathy, which has marked the opening of the campaign on both sides, must not be quickly construed as due entirely to indifference to the result. It rather means that, in the present era of good feeling, the voter is requiring more time for judgment; and that deliberation, rather than emotional excitement, will determine his final course. As a result, there are fewer brass bands and banner-raisings than in previous campaigns.

Premising this much, I am of opinion that the present prospects are very favorable to the Democratic party. We, to whom the management of the campaign has been intrusted, have, after due and careful consideration, every reason for confidence in a favorable result. Some of these reasons could not be stated without unduly anticipating the plan of the campaign and unnecessarily disclosing its details. In good time these will appear, and will, we think, amply vindicate the confidence we feel. There are other reasons, however, which may be briefly stated.

The first and most obvious is the result of such preceding elections as have enabled the people to pass judgment on Mr. Harrison's administration. When we reason from them, we do so from hard and inexorable facts. All other expressions of public thought are open to the possibility of misconstruction; but here are the final and decisive opinions of the people on given issues, expressed in the one method known to our institutions, namely, through the ballot-box. The logic of results admits of little escape, and the value of preceding elections in enabling us to estimate future results is increased by their frequency. In England, where the elections are held at irregular and often long intervals, the previous general elections are less important; but in this country, where the people meet annually, and on a stated day and

by a fixed political habit, to impress their wishes on their servants, the off-year elections are important and afford evidence of a certain continuity and coherency of public thought.

The first election at which the people had an opportunity to express their opinion as to the Harrison administration was in 1889. It had, at that time, come so recently into existence that the verdict then pronounced may be less significant than that of the succeeding year, 1890, when the policy of the "mailed hand" had been more openly displayed; nevertheless, the reactionary movement had commenced, and it is clear that the people were no longer satisfied with the administration. Of the politically important States, Massachusetts and Nebraska showed heavy Republican losses and corresponding Democratic gains in 1889: while Iowa, Montana, New York, Ohio and Rhode Island reversed their verdicts of the preceding year by giving substantial Democratic pluralities.

As compared to the storm which was to follow, the result of 1889 might be likened to "the cloud no bigger than a man's hand"; but, comparisons aside, it was a "vote of want of confidence" whose emphasis could not be mistaken.

Before the people had again met at the polls, the Fifty-first Congress had commenced its deliberations, if Mr. Reed will permit the use of the term. The McKinley Bill had received the President's signature; the Force Bill, with its revolutionary changes in the vital matter of our elections, had passed the House; and the Treasury, which Mr. Cleveland had left full to overflowing, had been emptied. These were briefly the issues upon which the two great parties went to the people. The result was the most emphatic condemnation of Republican men and measures that this generation has witnessed. Passing by the vote on State officers, the results of which are sometimes attributable to local and temporary causes, that for members of the House of Representatives can be safely taken as a true index to the condition of public thought. The total Democratic vote was 5,083,298, and the total Republican vote 4,282,922, thus giving the unprecedented Democratic majority of 800,376. The combined anti-Republican vote was 5,615,124, thus exceeding the Republican vote by 1,332,202. The Republican majority of 24 in the House was converted into the Democratic majority of 147.

It cannot be claimed that this astonishing result was due to a light vote or was the result of an off year. The elections of 1889 and 1891 might be open to such criticism; but the election midway between the Presidential struggles has invariably been highly significant of the latter's result.

Thus, the year 1874 witnessed a real Democratic tidal wave, only to be followed in 1876 by a result which, whatever one's opinion may be as to the merits of the electoral controversy, was a virtual Democratic victory. The Republicans were generally successful in the elections of 1878, and elected Garfield in 1880. Those of 1882 favored the Democratic party, and were prophetic of the result in 1884. The Democratic defeat in 1888 was logically preceded by one in 1886.

If, therefore, any deduction can be safely made from the experience of the past, it is that the phenomenal Democratic victory of 1890, flanked as it was by similar triumphs in 1889 and 1891, points to Mr. Cleveland's election in 1892.

To show the steady trend of public thought, the following table of pluralities in the States which are politically important is appended, the vote of 1888 being that for President:

	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.
Alabama	61,123 D.	.....	97,470 D.	.....
Colorado	13,207 R.	.....	8,382 R.	10,956 R.
Illinois	22,195 R.	.....	9,847 D.	.....
Indiana	2,348 R.	.....	19,579 D.	.....
Iowa	31,711 R.	6,523 D.	3,336 R.	8,216 D.
Kansas	80,159 R.	.....	8,053 R.	.....
Massachusetts	32,037 R.	6,775 R.	9,053 D.	6,467 D.
Michigan	22,923 R.	33,471 R.	11,520 D.	4,940 R.
Minnesota	38,106 R.	.....	2,267 R.	.....
Montana	5,126 R.	556 D.	283 D.	.....
Nebraska	27,873 R.	19,028 R.	1,144 D.	3,133 R.
Nevada	1,903 R.	.....	810 R.	.....
New Hampshire	2,342 R.	.....	93 R.	.....
New Jersey	7,149 D.	.....	14,253 D.	.....
New York	13,002 R.	20,527 D.	.....	47,937 D.
North Carolina	13,118 D.	.....	43,329 D.	.....
Ohio	19,599 R.	10,872 D.	10,970 R.	21,511 R.
Oregon	6,769 R.	.....	5,151 D.	.....
Rhode Island	4,438 R.	4,419 D.	1,560 D.	1,254 D.
West Virginia	506 D.	.....	8,337 D.	.....
Wisconsin	21,321 R.	.....	28,320 D.	.....

It will be noticed that the Democratic party has not only held all the States which it carried in 1888, but has largely increased its majorities. The Republican party, on the contrary, gained in but one State over 1888, that of Ohio; in all others their majorities in that year have been not only lessened materially, but have disappeared altogether in the important States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, New York, Rhode Island, and

Wisconsin, which have since given Democratic pluralities,—Iowa, New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts on two successive occasions.

Nor have the preliminary elections of 1892 been less encouraging to the Democracy. In Alabama it triumphed over the combined votes of the opposition parties; in Arkansas it substantially increased its majority; and in Oregon decreased the Republican plurality. The elections in Maine and Vermont are of too recent occurrence to need any extended reference here. They were signs of the times which the wayfarer could not miss. The Administration, realizing that each State had been, in past years, a most significant index to public thought, put forth extraordinary exertions to increase their majorities. Vermont, with one of its foremost Republicans in the cabinet, with a press almost wholly in its favor, and with prominent party men from other States appealing to its voters to give their party throughout the country the prestige of an increased vote, yet gives the smallest Republican majority since 1872. The vote, as compared with that of 1888, is as follows :

Governor, 1888.		*Governor*, 1892.	
Republican	48,522	Republican	39,190
Democratic	19,527	Democratic	19,526

A Democratic loss of one vote and a Republican loss of 9,332 can only mean, either that the Republican party is taking but little interest in the election, while the Democratic party is fully alive to its importance, or that a considerable number of the former voted the ticket of the latter. Either construction is favorable to the Democracy.

The vote in Maine, similarly compared, is:

Governor, 1888.		*Governor*, 1892.	
Republican	79,405	Republican	67,850
Democratic	61,317	Democratic	55,348

Here the party in power lost almost twice as many votes as its opponents.

No satisfactory explanation can be given of these figures that will give encouragement to the Republican party. To accuse its voters of being too "sensitive" or "timid" to vote under the Australian ballot system is hardly complimentary to their intelligence. To assume, on their part, a greater lack of interest in the coming election than that of the minority party, is to concede Mr. Cleveland's election.

The result of the elections which have just been held in Florida and Georgia still further emphasize the truth of the statement that the drift of sentiment is strongly towards the Democratic party.

The "vote of want of confidence," therefore, which Mr. Harrison says the Democratic party is now asking on his administration has already, and with unmistakable emphasis, been given in six successive elections. The issues have not changed. The McKinley Bill is still a law, without a suggestion from the Republican platform or its candidate's letter of acceptance that its burdens will be lightened. The Force Bill, while ignored in the letter, is yet demanded by the platform, and, like Banquo's ghost, "will not down." And the Treasury is as empty as Mr. Reed's Congress left it.

To say that the people are so variable as to approve in 1892 that which they signally condemned in 1889, 1890, and 1891 is to reflect upon their capacity for self-government. The Democracy has obtained a verdict in its action of ejectment, and is now asking that the consequent judgment of ouster should follow.

These figures are but eloquent of a change in public thought, of which other evidence might be multiplied. The Republicans who left their party in 1884 did so only temporarily and on personal grounds. When, however, Mr. Cleveland had dispelled the fear that the Democratic party could not be safely intrusted with power and had challenged the sober thought and conscience of his countrymen in the famous message of December, 1887, a new alignment of parties commenced, and many of the leading spirits of the Republican party in its earlier days joined hands with the Democracy in the great work of commercial emancipation. The change to the Democracy of such men as Carl Schurz, Wayne MacVeagh and Walter Q. Gresham affords one evidence of this; just as the course of the newspaper press (which, as Mr. Clarkson publicly lamented, is now throwing its greater influence in favor of the Democratic party) is another.

It is likewise a matter of common observation that a majority of the first voters are now giving their youthful zeal and robust strength to the party of tariff reform, as that most in sympathy with the ultimate commercial destiny of our country and most responsive to its highest needs.

Indeed, the campaign of education has not been without its re-

sults among any class. The manufacturer, whose raw materials are taxed and markets restricted; the laboring man, who has felt the purchasing power of his wages decreased by unnecessary taxation without a commensurate increase in its nominal amount, and the neglected consumer, have all given Mr. Cleveland's appeal for conservative revision a sober second thought since 1888.

There are other considerations, some of a temporary and exceptional character, which add to the probability of a coming Democratic victory. To a few of these allusion will be briefly made:

1. In 1888, the Democracy not only labored under the necessity of conducting a campaign of education on a long-neglected issue, but it was compelled to defend a general tariff bill, which, however, wise and salutary, yet, for good or ill, affected a variety of industries. This made the work of explanation and justification correspondingly difficult and complicated. We labor under neither disadvantage now. The opposition must defend the many schedules of the McKinley law, as we did the Mills Bill. Then, too, we in 1888 fought to a successful issue the elementary principles of the tariff question. That our country needs wider markets; that the tariff is a tax, and is paid by the domestic consumer; that the cheapening of commodities is desirable, for example, are questions no longer seriously disputed, as Mr. Harrison's letter of acceptance will amply show. They were seriously controverted in 1888, but are now abandoned. The present calm on the surface of politics indicates nothing more strongly than that the tariff scare is over, and that the spectre of free trade, like the bloody shirt, is relegated to "innocuous desuetude." It frightens no one in 1892 as it did in 1888.

2. The Democracy is not handicapped by the disappointments arising from the distribution of federal patronage, as it was in 1888; while, on the contrary, President Harrison's administration must face, in every township, village, and city, the lack of interest and at times open hostility arising from pleasing one man, to the bitter disappointment of other loyal partisans. To a party that has been so long in power that the irritation and jealousies arising from the original distribution of patronage has ceased the possession of government is an advantage; but this is as little true of Mr. Harrison in 1892 as it was of Mr. Cleveland in 1888.

3. The Democratic situation in New York is not complicated

in 1892 as it was in 1888 by the mutual and unfortunate misunderstandings that arise from the divided effort of electing a President and a Governor at the same election. The bitterness to which this supposed conflict of interests gave rise has disappeared, and Mr. Harrison must face this year a united Democracy in the great pivotal State. If other assurance were needed of unity in purpose of all interests than Senator Hill's able, admirable and cordial speeches in Brooklyn and Buffalo, it will be found in the fact that every organization of the party, in and out of New York city, is working in entire harmony and will keep step to the onward march of Tariff Reform.

4. It is believed that the Republican party has not and cannot now command the vast sums of money which it used with such efficacy in the last Presidential election. Assuming that it has an abundance of money, it can no longer with safety concentrate its forces as in 1888. The field of battle is much broader, and cannot be safely narrowed. Since the elections of 1889, 1890, and 1891, the sneer of "rainbow chasing" has lost its force. The pot of gold was found in the magnificent results achieved in States east and west of the Mississippi, which had heretofore been safely Republican. The Republican party can abandon especial effort in the States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Nevada, and South Dakota, in the West, and in the States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, in the East, only at great and obvious peril. Even with extraordinary effort on their part, the Democracy has good reason for expecting favorable results in more than one of these States, although such hope will not induce the Democratic leaders to relax a single effort in the States generally regarded as pivotal. We do not need the electoral votes of the States just mentioned, and are, therefore, not under the disadvantage under which the party in power labors of being compelled to weaken its forces by dissipating them over a vast area of debatable ground.

5. In the States commonly regarded as destined to be decisive, namely, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana, we fight from the vantage-ground of having won the intermediate elections since 1888 by increasing pluralities.

6. The assured votes which Michigan, under her law of district representation, will give us should not be overlooked; nor

the possibility that the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado and South Dakota may cast their electoral votes in whole or in part for Mr. Weaver, by reason of the fusion of parties in these States.

7. The Australian ballot system has very generally come into operation since the last election for President, and it is not disputed that, wherever adopted, its results have been beneficial to the Democracy. The intimidation of employees, upon which the Republican party has placed great reliance, can no longer be successfully practised.

8. Finally, Mr. Cleveland's great popularity is a tower of strength for his cause. The people have generally indorsed Mr. Depew's tribute to him as the "typical American." He is stronger with the masses to-day, out of power, than when he was President. His former defeat, suffered through manly adherence to principle, has only served to endear him with many, who prefer courage to time-serving and honor to mere expediency. Despite his many estimable traits of head and heart, and the general respect in which Mr. Harrison is held, it can hardly be said that he occupies an equal place with Mr. Cleveland in the affections of the people.

For these reasons, among others, while not underestimating the power, vigor, untiring energy, and extensive resources of the opposition, and fully appreciating that the battle is not won until the last vote is counted (and sometimes, as in 1876, not even then), I am of opinion that the next President will be a Democrat.

W. F. HARRITY.

WASTE PRODUCTS MADE USEFUL.

BY THE RIGHT HON. LORD PLAYFAIR, F. R. S., LL. D.

As KNOWLEDGE progresses, man discovers new uses for the most common objects, and learns that, though bodies may undergo many transformations, each one has its destined utility. Nature is most economical of material, and does not admit the idea that any substance can become useless. The waste matter of animals during their lives and their own bodies after death become transformed into the food of plants and constitute the basis for new generations of living beings. We know also that the very dust blown by winds from place to place has its use in the atmosphere, because, through its agency, clouds and rains are produced, as well as the glorious colors of the sky.

As nature does not admit the idea of waste matter, man, when under the guidance of knowledge, should not be inclined to deem anything as a waste product. It may be unused, because he has not learned how to apply it to a useful purpose, but the time arrives when it will be converted into a practical utility. The whole history of manufactures is a commentary on this text. The refuse of the produce of to-day may possibly become the chief source of profit to-morrow. Scarcely a single article of use or ornament, after it has served its first purpose, is not used over again for another service, perhaps in a new and distinct form, or in composition with other materials. Manufacturing industry loves to work up odds and ends and even the human refuse of our shops and homes. But these applications require a thorough knowledge of the objects to be converted into new utilities.

In the seventeenth century the illustrious Boyle wrote an essay entitled, "Man's great ignorance of the uses of Natural Things; or, that there is no one thing in Nature whereof the uses to Human Life are yet thoroughly understood." This truth of the seventeenth century is equally true as we approach the

twentieth. Those who have read my articles upon air and water will recollect how slowly our knowledge accumulated in regard to these most familiar objects, and will be convinced how much remains for us in the future progress of knowledge before we or our descendants can say with truth that we really know everything about the most familiar things under our constant observation.

Lord Palmerston is credited with having invented the happy definition that "dirt is merely matter in a wrong place." It is difficult to say who is the real author of a popular apothegm. I once, in a fit of idleness, tried to trace the author of the saying that a blunt, plain speaker "calls a spade a spade." I did not succeed in finding the original author, but I found it used as a well-known proverb by Philip of Macedonia, the father of Alexander the Great. This is a parenthesis, so we may give Lord Palmerston the credit for the excellent definition of dirt, until some of my readers trace it further back. The object of this article is to show that, as science advances, it sweeps up dirt from the wrong place and deposits it in the right place.

The first illustration is the common lucifer match for producing instantaneous light or flame. This is now such an essential comfort and even necessity of our daily life that it may be difficult for some to believe it was unknown in my youth, for it was only introduced in 1833. We should remember the difficult and laborious processes employed by the ancients to obtain light and how careful they were to preserve the sacred fire when it had been procured. As the world grew older the fire-making processes were slowly improved. The *Pyxidicula Ignaria* of the Romans was probably a rude kind of tinder-box, though not in its more modern form of flint, steel, tinder and a sulphur match such as I used in my early days. It was indeed used in much the same form in the middle ages, for Philip the Good, 1429, carried the tinder-box upon the collar of the Golden Fleece, as showing to what an advanced stage of science his generation had reached. It is indeed surprising that phosphorus matches were so slowly discovered, for the element of phosphorous had been described by an Arabian called Bechel in the eighth century, though it was forgotten, and had to be rediscovered by Brandt in 1669. Both of them got it out of liquid human refuse, after it had been changed by keeping. Subsequently a cheaper and less repulsive raw material was found in old bones, which are rich in phosphate of lime; now the skeletons of

carcasses are chiefly used for the preparation of lucifer matches. Though phosphorus was known and its remarkable properties had become familiar, it was not till 1833 that the first phosphorus friction match was invented, I remember my own extreme joy when the phosphorus match was first invented. Intolerably bad the first matches were, dangerously inflammable, horribly poisonous to the makers and injurious to the lungs of the users. It was not till 1845 that my friend Schröter, of Vienna, showed that by heating phosphorus in an oil bath it became converted into the form of red brick, which was an allotropic condition of the element which did not poison the makers of matches and was much less inflammable than ordinary phosphorus.

What a wonderful change has been produced in all our habits by the ready means of obtaining light out of the material formerly extracted from human effete matter, and now from old bones! Before its application to matches it is calculated that every man, woman and child spent ninety hours yearly in getting light and fire, or rather that they would have done so if they had used such means as freely as we do now. At present the consumption of phosphorus matches per head of the population amounts to eight daily, and as each match consumes fifteen seconds in its use two minutes are spent for the whole day, or twelve hours for the year. If we calculate the economy of time to the population of the United States by this simple invention, each person saves seventy-eight hours yearly; or, say, ten working days, which, represented in labor, cost at half a dollar per day for the sixty-two millions of the population in the United States, gives an aggregate economy of three hundred and ten million dollars yearly.

Originally, phosphorus was made from liquid effete matter of human beings, and, unhappily, that is treated to a great extent as waste even now, for it is allowed to run into the sea by the drains. Yet every pound of it, if properly applied in agriculture, is capable of producing a pound of wheat. Victor Hugo, who early wrote on such subjects, was moved to an indignant protest in "Les Miserables:"

"Science, after long experiment, now knows that the most effective of manures is that of man. The Chinese, we must say to our shame, knew it before us. No Chinese peasant, Eckberg tells us, goes to the city without carrying back, at the two ends of his bamboo, two buckets full of what we call filth. Thanks to human fertilization, the earth in China is still as young as in the days of Abraham. Chinese wheat yields one hundred and

fifty fold. To employ the city to enrich the plain would be a sure success. If our gold is filth, on the other hand our filth is gold. What is done with this filth which is gold? It is swept into the abyss."

The agriculture of the United States is an industry great in its extent, but it is probably the most thriftless industry in existence. English agriculture is bad enough, but it produces on an average from thirty to forty bushels of wheat per acre. But the farmers of the United States produce an average of only twelve bushels per acre. This arises from the temptation to seek new land when the old farms have become unproductive from a wasteful system of agriculture.

In the year 1842 I had the pleasure to accompany the illustrious German chemist, Baron Liebig, in a tour through Great Britain. On one of our excursions, my friend, the eminent geologist, Dr. Buckland, joined us, and he took us to see some curious concretions in rocks of Tertiary formations. Buckland had for some time suspected that these stone nodules really were the fossils of the dung of ancient Saurian reptiles, which dwelt on the earth long before man's appearance upon it. As a proof, he showed that the concretions had a spiral twisting like that seen in the exuviæ of living fishes. Liebig suggested that it would be a better proof of fossil dung if chemical analysis showed that it was rich in phosphates. I sent a portion of it to my laboratory, and Liebig's belief was confirmed, as all the concretions were rich in bone earth. The name *coprolite* was given to this fossil dung (*kopros*, dung, and *lithos*, a stone). The publication of this discovery led to the establishment of extensive industries for the preparation of superphosphates as manure, although now the use of coprolites is being superseded by the discovery of mineral phosphates in rocks. Besides its use as manure, human refuse is still largely employed in making ammonia and its salts, which are largely used in the industrial arts, in agriculture, and in medicine. Originally, *sal ammoniac* was prepared from the soot of the burnt sacrifices at the temple of Jupiter Ammon, from which the word ammonia is derived. At a later period it was obtained from camel's dung, and then for many centuries out of human refuse. It is even now made from that, for two thousand two hundred tons are taken daily out of the cesspools of Paris to be converted into ammonia. Luckily the Parisian ladies, when they use their scent bottles, little suspect the origin of the pungent odor.

Ammonia is, however, made on a more extensive scale from the refuse of gas works. The users of Morocco leather little suspect that the goat skins converted into it have been liberally treated with the sweepings of dog kennels.

Many kinds of waste materials of certain manufactures are employed in new forms for other industries. Old rags are a familar instance of this change. Cotton and linen rags form the chief raw material for the paper maker. Even those, which a beggar would disdain to touch, are converted into the paper used to convey our sentiments of love and friendship. Baron Liebig endeavored to find some material, which, by its use among various nations, would form an index to their relative degree of civilization. He fixed upon soap as showing the cleanliness or filth common to the people. The average consumption of soap gave the scale of civilization. I am more inclined to consider that the competition for cotton and linen rags denotes a still better index, because it is a measure of the distribution of education and love for literature. I have no statistics since 1887, but in that year the proportion of paper used in different countries was 12 lbs. per head in the United Kingdom; 10 lbs. in the United States; 9 lbs. in Germany; 8 lbs. in France, and 4 lbs. in Italy. The mother country and the United States are thus in the lead.

Woollen rags are more slowly converted into final products than those of cotton and linen, because they are valuable for intermediate uses. Before they are run to earth they do duty for many forms of cheap clothing. In the United Kingdom Batley, Dewsbury and Leeds are the grand markets for woollen rags, though the United States are running us in close competition. The greasy, frowsy cast-off clothes of Europe reappear in pilot cloths, Petershams, beavers, Talmas, Chesterfields and Mohairs, which modern dandies wear when they consult economy as well as their outward appearance. Shoddy and mungo, the resurrection raw material of greasy beggars, mixed with a varying amount of true wool, is supposed to constitute about one-third of the woollen manufactures. This raw material for adulteration is, however, only made from rags which have already served higher purposes before this tertiary use. When woollen rags still adhere together they first go through the hands of various artists, who are named "clobberers," "revivers," and "translators." The function of the clobberer is to patch up torn garments and restore them to

their pristine appearance. The reviver rejuvenates seedy black coats, and sells them to customers seeking for cheap garments. The translator is an artist of a higher order, for he transforms the skirts of old coats into waistcoats and tunics for children. When black coats are too far gone to be clobbered or revived, they are sent to various countries to be made into caps, France, Russia, and Poland requiring them in large quantity. The worn-out red tunics of British soldiers almost exclusively go to Holland to cover the chests of sturdy Dutchmen, who conceive them to be a protection against rheumatism. Uniforms of a better description, whether military or liveries, chiefly go to Africa for the wear of kings and chiefs. It is only after these transformations that the rags are torn down into shoddy and mungo for inferior cloths.

When old woollen rags have reached their fourth stage of degradation, so that they are unfit for the shoddy maker, they are still economically useful. They are then mixed with other degraded waste, such as shavings of hoofs and horns, and the blood of slaughter houses, and are melted in an iron pot with wood ashes and scrap iron. This process produces the material out of which the beautiful dye Prussian blue is made.

I fancy that I have convinced my readers, with perhaps some shock to their sentiment, that dirt is merely matter in a wrong place. When converted into an utility it is no longer dirt, for it has been purified. Manufacturers are only imitating Nature in these transformations. It may be disagreeable to sentiment, but it is strictly true, that our daily food contains the materials of previous generations of living animals, including the human race.

As to perfumes, there are some which are really oils and ethers extracted from flowers. There are others which are made artificially, and curiously, most frequently, out of bad-smelling compounds. The fusel-oil, separated out in the distillation of spirits, has a peculiarly nasty and sickening odor. It is used, after treatment with acids and oxidizing agents, to make the oil of apples and the oil of pears. Oil of grapes and oil of cognac are little more than fusel-oil largely diluted. Oil of pineapples, on the other hand, is best made by the action of putrid cheese on sugar, or by distilling rancid butter with alcohol and oil of vitriol. This oil is largely used for making pineapple ale. Many a fair forehead used to be damped with "Eau de Millefleurs" without knowing that its essential ingredient was got from the drainings

of cow houses, though now it can be obtained cheaper from one of the constituents of gas tar. Out of the latter is got oil of bitter almonds, so largely used to perfume soap and confectionery.

This leads me to refer to gas tar, once the most inconvenient of waste materials. It could not be thrown away into rivers, for it polluted them foully. It could not be buried in the earth because it destroyed vegetation all around. In fact nothing could be done with it except to burn or to mix it with coal as a fuel. Gas tar, formerly the most useless of waste substances, is now the raw material for producing beautiful dyes, some of our most valued medicines, a saccharine substance three hundred times sweeter than sugar, and the best disinfectants for the destruction of germs of disease. Tar has become so prolific in useful industries that it would take a long article to describe them in detail, so I can only allude to a few of them. There are two substances in tar called naphthalene and anthracene. The former of these was a waste material, which choked gas pipes and was particularly obnoxious in gas works. Every ounce of it is now of value for the preparation of dye stuffs, as is also anthracene, a body which distils over when the tar oils have got a boiling point above 300°.

Perhaps the most important use is in the manufacture of alizarin, the coloring matter found in the root of the madder plant, so extensively used at one time in making Turkey reds and in calico printing. The discovery of its artificial preparation from the waste products of tar has destroyed a great agricultural industry which flourished in Turkey, Holland, Alsace, and other countries. Not only the red dye stuff alizarin, but also beautiful blue and purple dyes are made out of the same substances.

There is another product called aniline, which exists naturally in coal tar, but can also be made in large quantities out of another substance named benzine, after it has been acted on by nitric acid and then by iron filings. Aniline has become a most productive source of coloring matter, and many of its derivations are familarly known under the names of mauve, magenta, uraniline, and other dyes. They are too numerous to describe, but there is scarcely a shade of color which cannot be obtained from some of the products of tar. Large manufactories are in existence, some of which contain forty or fifty trained chemists engaged in superintending operations, or in making researches for new coloring materials. The whole of the great industries of

dyeing and calico printing has been revolutionized by the new coloring matters obtained from the old waste material—gas tar. By a very interesting series of transformations one of the constituents of coal tar has been changed into the coloring matter of indigo. Hitherto the cost of production of artificial indigo has been too great to allow it to take the place of natural indigo, the cultivation of which is one of the staple industries of the East Indies. But its cultivators tremble lest they should find themselves in the position of the growers of madder by a cheap artificial production of indigo blue from coal tar.

I have noticed in American newspapers that many cases of arsenic poisoning have been observed in the United States, produced by dresses or articles of furniture. Coal tar colors are often made with arsenic, and the danger is not overrated.

When Bishop Berkeley wrote his famous treatise on tar water, claiming it as a universal medicine, curing all diseases, he little dreamt that the time would arrive when beautiful medicinal preparations would be made out of it.

As a fact, important narcotics and febrifuges have forced their way into medicine from this source, and are much valued by physicians. The most curious of the useful products of coal tar is saccharin, a substance so sweet that the sensation on the palate is disagreeable from its cloying persistency. A grain or two grains give the sweetness of one or two lumps of sugar, and it can be taken in food without producing the dyspeptic and gouty results which real sugar produces on some persons. Thus one of the most hopeless forms of waste matter—tar—has, by our better knowledge, become productive of great uses to mankind.

I shall content myself with only one further illustration.

Of all living things rats seem to be among the most repulsive; and when dead what can be their use? But even they are the subjects of production in the industrial arts. In Paris there is a pound surrounded by walls into which all dead carcasses are thrown. A large colony of rats has been introduced from the catacombs. The rats are most useful in clearing the flesh from the bones, leaving a clean-polished skeleton fitted for the makers of phosphorus. At the base of the wall numerous shallow holes are scooped out just sufficient to contain the body of the rats but not their tails. Every three months a great *battue* takes place, during which the terrified rats run into the holes. Persons go

round and catching the extending tails, pitch the rats into bags, and they are killed at leisure. Then begins the manufacture. The fur is valuable and finds a ready sale. The skins make a superior glove—the *gant de rat*—and are especially used for the thumbs of kid gloves, because the skin of the rat is strong and elastic. The thigh-bones were formerly valued as tooth-picks for clubs, but are now out of fashion; while the tendons and bones are boiled up to make the gelatine wrappers for bon-bons.

Surely I have established my thesis that dirt is only matter in a wrong place.

Chemistry, like a thrifty housewife, economizes every scrap. The horseshoe nails dropped in the streets are carefully collected, and reappear as swords and guns. The main ingredient of the ink with which I now write was probably once the broken hoop of an old beer barrel. The chippings of the travelling tinker are mixed with the parings of horses' hoofs and the worst kinds of woollen rags, and these are worked up into an exquisite blue dye, which graces the dress of courtly dames. The dregs of port wine, carefully decanted by the toper, are taken in the morning as a seidlitz powder, to remove the effect of the debauch. The offal of the streets and the wastings of coal gas reappear carefully preserved in the lady's smelling bottle, or used by her to flavor blanc manges for her friends. All this thrift of material is an imitation of the economy of nature, which allows no waste. Everything has its destined place in the process of the universe, in which there is not a blade of grass or even a microbe too much, if we possessed the knowledge to apply them to their fitting purposes. Man aims at the acquisition of this knowledge, and, as we attain it, we are always rewarded by indirect though important benefits to the human race. It is neither necessary nor desirable that we should seek knowledge for the sake of utilities: our reward comes when we search for truth, because it is truth. If we try to use the rays of knowledge on account of their own inherent beauty, their reflection upon all things, animate and inanimate, show properties of matter which range themselves into utilities, almost without our perceiving the process, and teach us that there is nothing common or unclean to the laws of science.

LYON PLAYFAIR.

HOW TO SOLVE THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

BY THE RT. REV. MONSIGNOR BERNARD O'REILLY.

THERE ought to be no quarrel between the Catholic Church in the United States and our Common School System. There is a misunderstanding; but this is easily cleared up, for where both parties are equally earnest and sincere in the patriotic purpose which prompts them to educate, and in the religious conviction that would have our youth trained up in the knowledge of Christianity and the practice of its noblest virtues, it is impossible that all grounds of misapprehension should not disappear.

American love of freedom, of freedom of conscience before and above all, is too deep and too honest to wish to enforce a law, or to support a system demonstrably hostile to the essentials of religious liberty. Our people have only to be shown that the law strikes at the dearest rights of the family, and confiscates to the profit of the State the most sacred and inalienable prerogatives of the parent, to conclude that such legislation can only be productive of evil, instead of promoting the public good.

It is my conviction, therefore, that there is not in the United States a citizen desirous at once of the progress of popular education, and of the spread of enlightened religious sentiment among the masses, who does not, in every essential respect, agree with the Catholic Church about the requisites of early education in the home and in the school.

Let an educational congress, representing every religious denomination among us, meet during two or three years in succession and discuss the necessity of permeating education with the light and warmth of religion. We should, ere the end of the third year's friendly discussion, see our way towards a satisfactory settlement of this controversy. Let them come together by common agreement and compare views fearlessly, like freemen who

love the truth and court it, calmly, like men who have no selfish interests to gain, nothing but the common good and a generous brotherly feeling to promote. I have always admired the noble utterance of St. Augustine, that incomparable champion of the Christian religion. "For what end does truth triumph," he says, "if not to spread the reign of charity?" *Quid est victoria veritatis nisi Charitas?*

It would be a most blessed result of the timid suggestion thrown out in the pages of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, if such a congress or convention as is here hinted at were to meet next year in Chicago. The Columbian Exposition will afford a most favorable opportunity for such an assemblage of earnest, enlightened and representative men.

It is high time that the great body of the American people should clearly understand on what principles the Catholic church advocates a religious education for our youth. Hitherto our bishops and archbishops have abstained, as a body, from taking sides publicly in the school controversy. In the last National Council of Baltimore, held in November, 1884, admirable decrees and instructions were promulgated, and afterwards sanctioned by the Holy See, urging everywhere the erection and equipment of parish schools, dependent on their respective churches in each diocese. But, most generously though the Catholic congregations all over the land have responded to the call of their bishops, it is none the less true, as all fair-minded Protestants have more than once acknowledged, that it is an intolerable hardship and a grievous injustice to tax Catholic parents for the erection and maintenance of our common schools. The primary school, according to orthodox Catholic principle and practice, carries on for the child the work of instruction and education begun in the home; the whole atmosphere of the school must, therefore, be Christian, Catholic.

Religion openly, thoroughly taught, freely and heartily practised, is the basis of all true education, whether given within the bosom of the family or given in the school. This is a central principle from which the Catholic Church never can, never will depart. Where Catholic families form only a small minority, too poor to have a school of their own and to pay at the same time the school tax, necessity may compel them to have their children instructed in the public school. There it may happen that no

religion whatever is taught, or that as little as possible of a religious character is given to the school exercises, or that this very little is tinged with anti-Catholic prejudice.

I need not say here that schools from which all religious teaching and influence is banished are hateful to Catholic parents. They only produce indifference to all religion, and turn out godless and unprincipled men and women. Of this result eminent clergymen and laymen of every creed have loudly and justly complained. Such an education as this is totally at variance with the American character and American institutions.

The question of free denominational education as opposed to State schools supported by public taxation, is now a great American question. The vital interests of the country demand that it should be examined and decided on American principles.

It is an historical fact that the public school system was introduced into the United States at the same time and for the same purpose that the national schools were imposed by law on Ireland. Archbishop Whately, who was the great advocate and champion of this latter system, declared,—as his sister testifies in his Life, —that the aim and hope of the founders were to "decatholicize" the youth of Ireland. It is equally notorious that the avowed object of the public school system in our country was to create a safeguard against the dangers,—as it was said,—with which the great influx of Irish immigrants threatened "the Religion of the Bible," American liberty, and American institutions.

This was a most impolitic movement, condemned by some of the most illustrious American statesmen, and openly at variance with true American principles.

Just think of it, for one moment. The natural tendency of the American mind and the American heart would or should have been to forget all differences of religion, while extending to these sorely-tried exiles from Ireland a generous and unanimous welcome. They had fought the battle of centuries against oppression. They were known for their enthusiastic devotion to the American Republic; and their own brothers, on land and sea, had gloriously upheld our flag.

These exiles had, for generations, been subjected in the land of their birth to intellectual starvation, as well as to constantly recurring famine. For generations it was felony in Ireland for the Catholic Celt to teach or to be taught. At the close of the

eighteenth century and far into the middle of the next, the still oppressed remnants of that doubly famished race, ravenously hungered and thirsted for knowledge. When the writer of this article was born, the days of "Hedge-Schools" had passed, but the first most pregnant lessons received by him in early boyhood were given by a hedge-school master.

Well, when after 1830, the Irish immigrants began to pour into your free land, with love and gratitude in their hearts, and well-founded hope gilding all their prospects, had it not been good policy, genuine American policy, to welcome them warmly, to bid them drink their fill of liberty and of that knowledge for which they had so long thirsted in vain? Their fathers in ages long gone by had welcomed to Ireland yearly thousands of scholars from Great Britain, who were housed, fed, clothed, taught freely, lovingly, by this hospitable, warm-hearted, intellectual Celtic race.

But when these immigrants came to you and seated themselves by your mighty lakes and rivers; when fathers among them stretched out their hands and asked for the free bread of knowledge for their little ones,—what did they get?

You built schools antagonistic to the faith of the new-comers, and you taxed *them* for the erection and maintenance of these schools! And because we do not thankfully accept this boon, which we neither expected nor asked for, you say that we make war on American institutions, and are a danger to American freedom!

Frankly, is this American?

Now let me tell you what all true Americans think on this most important matter of education, and on what practical principles they would have this vexed question settled.

With them—no matter what the federal constitution may say or not say—Religion is the corner-stone, as well as the crown and pinnacle of our social edifice. Nothing is more abhorrent to our natural reverence for religion than families in our Christian community devoid of all religious belief and practice. We can never cease to believe that one of the most essential duties of the State or civil government, is to protect the family in its divine labor of rearing its children and forming them to all the duties and virtues of perfect manhood and womanhood. Perfect they cannot be without religious training.

The school only carries on the work begun at the family hearth. The teachers derive their authority from the parents, whose place they hold and whose work they do. It is the duty of the State to encourage and assist this labor of educating, respecting and protecting while so doing, the divinely given and indefeasible rights of the parent.

Yes,—the part of the State is to encourage and to foster. This will strike the ripest scholar and most experienced statesman as being the attitude of the government, especially in a country and under institutions like our own.

Starting, then, on the assumption that religious instruction and all the living light and warmth which religion can impart to the work of the teacher, should not be separated in the school from the imparting of secular knowledge and professional training, I come to this necessary conclusion:—

Since, in a community divided into numerous religious denominations, denominational schools are a practical necessity, let the State bestow with impartial justice the moneys of the school fund derived from taxation, on the schools which do their work thoroughly;—and let every school receive such further encouragement as the State shall judge fit in proportion to the way the work of instruction is performed.

This is the principle on which the honors and pecuniary rewards of the Board of Intermediate Education in Ireland are distributed. No question is asked about the religious teaching given in the school, or about the denomination to which teacher and pupil belong. The work done by both, as evidenced in the result of the written and oral examinations submitted to the board, is what is passed upon by both examiners and commissioners. It is the excellence and thoroughness of the work done in the school which is proclaimed to the world every year and rewarded by the prizes bestowed on the pupils and the money remuneration awarded to the teacher. These awards are strictly in proportion to the results achieved ; that is, the public moneys and the public honors are given to those who do the best work, and in proportion to its degree of excellence.

This is a golden rule,—one which approves itself to our idea of justice, and to the practical good sense of a great community, free, industrial, and progressive.

Sooner or later we shall have to come to it in the matter of

public education. We shall be compelled by the very force of circumstances to allow both Protestants and Catholics to have schools of their own, and to give them for the erection and maintenance of the same a just share of the school fund for which they have been taxed.

BERNARD O'REILLY, Prothonotary Apostolic.

SWISS AND FRENCH ELECTION METHODS.

BY KARL BLIND.

I

When you asked me to say something on Continental election methods, in view of the Presidential campaign in your own country, my thoughts at once went to the Swiss and the French republics, and, curiously enough, to the older German empire. But what—some will perhaps exclaim—have those ancient Kaisers, with their crown and sceptre, to do with elections?

Why, a very great deal, indeed! "Freedom is ancient. It is despotism which is of modern growth," said Madame de Staël, with perfect truth. And Montesquieu, the great legist, who had travelled in Germany and other neighboring countries, including Hungary, Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and England, endeavoring everywhere to make himself acquainted with the spirit of the laws of the various nations, had already written, nearly a hundred years before Madame de Staël: "From the forests of Germany the liberties of England had come."

I have no special desire, I need scarcely assure the reader, to sing the praise of the mediæval "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." Yet, I would point out that under that empire all the princes, the highest as well as those of lesser grades, were originally simple officials, deposable by the central authority of the realm in case of maladministration. No attributes of sovereignty belonged to them. They were merely the appointed administrators of the several provinces. It was only through successive acts of lawless encroachment, of downright rebellion, sometimes of treacherous alliance with a foreign power, that they gradually achieved an independent position, which finally sapped the unity of the nation.

As to our Emperors, they, all through our history, did not hold their "tenure" of power "by the grace of God," nor by

any law of inheritance. They were rulers by election, all of them. Constitutionally speaking, they, too, could be removed from their apparently proud place.

Yes; in what we call those benighted middle ages, and even down to the beginning of the present century, when the German Empire fell in 1806, every Kaiser issued—like a President of the Swiss Confederacy, of the French republic, or of the United States of America now—from an election. It was not even necessary that a Prince born in the purple should be chosen. Any "full free man" might be returned. So it is laid down in Article 103 of our old code, called the *Schwabenspiegel*, which was written in the language of Upper Germany.

"The Germans elect the King," says Article 98 of the same old law-book. Practically, no doubt, a College of Princes, spiritual and temporal, had assumed, in course of time, the right of choosing the King—a right which of old had belonged to a vast open assembly of freemen. Still, the great fact remained of the imperial authority being created afresh, in each case, by the election method, from the ninth to the nineteenth century.

If I may make a comparison—which, like all comparisons, limps a little—I should say that Germany then was a commonwealth with a rudimentary substratum of republican liberties, and with aristocratic power superposed—a commonwealth at whose head stood a crowned president returned for life-time, who could be unseated by his peers for felony and misdemeanor. In a clumsy way even that somewhat unphilosophical arrangement bore the mark of a time-honored German love of self-government. We called this foreman of the aristocracy the "King of the Germans;" not of Germany, be it well observed. He had no claim to the land. He was only the head magistrate of the citizens of the nation. As such he was crowned at Aachen. He obtained the further name of Kaiser, or "Emperor of the Romans," after the Bishop at Rome had poured some oil on his head. This additional Italian title of the German ruler contained, as it were, a great historical revenge, on the part of the Teutonic race, for the conquering policy of invasion which the Romans had once pursued against us, and which had ended with the overthrow of their world-dominion. For centuries a personal journey to Rome had to be made by the King of the Germans in order to receive the title of Roman Emperor. Towards the end of the fifteenth

century, however, a Reichstag, or imperial parliament, decreed that this title belonged to our kings by a national right.

Once elected, the "King of the Germans" only remained legally so as long as he observed the charter he had sworn to maintain. No laws could be proclaimed by him without the assent of the Parliamentary Estates. If he broke the charter, they were empowered to resist him by force of arms. According to a special enactment, the King-Emperor could be tried and deposed for any violation of the compact. A regular tribunal was established for such cases—as may be seen from article 52 (B 3) of the *Sachsenspiegel*, our old law-book written in Low German. The Lord Chief Justice appointed for the contingency in question was the Count Palatine on the Rhine. Even the life of the King-Emperor would be declared to be forfeited as soon as the trial for any unconstitutional act of his had resulted in his deposition from the kingship. (*Schwabenspiegel*, Art. 105.)

Certainly, there was, legally speaking, no "right divine of kings to govern wrong" in ancient Germany. In reality, it is true, if an anachronistic expression may be permitted, "a coach and four" was sometimes driven through that constitution. That often happens with constitutions when nations are not very watchful. Still, even so late as the second half of the seventeenth century, in spite of many changes for the worse, Algernon Sidney, in his "Discourses Concerning Government," wrote of the Germans (the italics are his own):

> "Their princes, according to their merit, had the right of persuading, *not the power of commanding*; and the question was not what part of the government they would allow to the nobility and people, but what the nobility and people would give to their princes. . . . Whoever understands the affairs of Germany knows that the present emperors, notwithstanding their haughty title, had a power limited as in the days of Tacitus. If they are good and wise they may persuade; but they can command no further than the law allows. . . . No man, I presume, thinks any monarchy more limited, or more clearly derived from a delegated power, than that of the German emperors."

In the same "Discourses" the English writer emphatically dwelt on the position of the free Hanseatic towns. Their league was a republican one, on the lines of policy of a patrician merchant class. Now Algernon Sidney, the republican who paid the penalty of his principles on the scaffold, must have known something of the difference between a limited and elective mon-

archy, as it then existed in Germany, and the personal government of a despotically inclined hereditary king like Charles II.

II.

After this reference to the old German Empire, whose institutions are often misunderstood, though they actually contained the germ of republican government, we will turn to Switzerland and her methods of electing representatives of the people and chief magistrates of the commonwealth.

The Alpine country known to-day as Switzerland once formed an integral part of the German Empire as much as Suabia, Bavaria, Franconia, Saxony, or any other province did, or as Prussia and the smaller states at present do. When, however, the central authority of the empire began to decay through the efforts of our princely families to make themselves semi-sovereign in their local territories, both the political cohesion and the freedom of the nation were seriously threatened. "Under these circumstances," to quote the words of our patriotic historian, Wirth, "the towns instinctively felt that civic liberty was in imminent danger, and they had resort, therefore, to the only means of salvation left to them—a general league of cities." These leagues took the name of *Eidgenossen*, that is, "companions bound together by an oath," namely for the overthrow of tyranny.

The first league of this kind was formed between the towns of Mayence, Worms, Speier, Frankfort, and several others. It soon spread to Cologne and Aachen in the north; to Colmar, Basel and Zürich in the south; all German towns then. It kept a good civic establishment of foot warriors, horse, and a pretty array of ships on the Rhine and the Moselle.

This is not the place to show how so great and promising a popular movement seemed at one time to bring about the democratic regeneration of Germany; but the changeful fortune of war only favored the *Eidgenossen* of Upper Allemannia in the battles of Morgarten, Sempach, and Näfels. Other members of that league in Lower Allemannia were defeated in the battle of Döffingen, in 1388, through the treachery of a nobleman, the leader of the Nuremburg contingent, who had been promised a bribe. On this point, the historian Wirth says:

"Had the citizens obtained the victory also there, the Swiss constitution of to-day would have been spread over all southern Germany: and later

it would likewise have been extended over all our lower countries through the action of the Hansa. As it was, civic liberty was destroyed, the last obstacle to unlimited princely sovereignty removed, and, together with freedom, union vanished. This was a terrible national misfortune. . . . . The defeat of the citizen warriors at Döffingen was decisive in this sense, that Germany entered upon the road of becoming a medley of monarchies claiming separate existence. Our wretched condition at home, the loss of our power abroad, sprang from this cause. The genius of the Fatherland covered its face in sorrow when the dead body of Konrad Besserer (the heroic burgomaster of Ulm) was enshrouded in the banner of freedom on the battlefield of Döffingen."

Meanwhile the local victories in the Alpine fastness gave rise to republican communities, which finally blossomed into the *Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft.* So it still calls itself to-day, and its citizens proudly bear the name of "*Eidgenossen,*" in accordance with the designation of the fourteenth century.

Separation from Germany the Swiss did at first not intend. They remained faithful to the national bond as long as possible. On its part, the German Empire was loath to release them entirely from all allegiance, however vague and shadowy, even after the Swiss had clearly renounced it. Their final severance from connection with Germany was only settled, by treaty, in 1648, after the conclusion of the Thirty Years' War, when the country which once had been the common Fatherland was utterly exhausted.

I now rapidly pass to the present constitution of Switzerland and its election methods. Forty-five years ago—as I mentioned in a previous essay—that Confederacy was composed of an ill-assorted conglomerate of either democratically or aristocratically governed, partly also priest-ridden, cantons, each of which maintained its own sovereignty. In fact, Switzerland even then still bore the mark of her former connection with Imperial Germany. Being shaken by a Separatist League, the Mountain Confederacy had to pass through a civil war—even as was the fate of the United States of America within more recent times.

Fortunately, the campaign of 1847 against the Sonderbund brought a quick and decisive victory. The reformed constitution, which was then elaborated—and the proclamation of which I heard as an exile on Swiss soil, in September 1848, amidst the roar of cannon—introduced a great many ameliorations in the sense of closer union, of fuller democratic freedom, and of a more efficient system of national defence.

As in the United States of America every State, so in Switzerland

every Canton, has its local legislature and government. The way in which the Swiss Confederacy was gradually built up, and the existence of not less than four languages (German, French, Italian and Romansch) within its several parts, accounts for the difficulties of a stricter union. The three first named languages have equal official rights as regards the publication of the laws. Surely a very fair arrangement, considering that more than two-thirds of the Swiss are of German race and speech.

According to article 60 of the constitution, the supreme power is vested in the *Bundes-Versammlung*, or Federal Assembly, which is composed of two parts: the *National-Rath* and the *Stände-Rath;* corresponding to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. The National-Rath (National Council) is elected by the Swiss people at large. The Stände-Rath (or Council of the Estates), is appointed by the Cantons; each Canton, whether large or small, sending two members.

Coming together as a Congress, the members of the two Federal Legislatures (National-Rath and Stände-Rath) combined elect an Executive which is called *Bundes-Rath* (Federal Council). It is composed of seven members, and its term of office is three years. Any Swiss who is eligible for the National-Rath or House of Deputies—that is, every citizen who has the right of vote, and who is not a member of the clergy—may be chosen to fill a place in this supreme Executive of the republic. A special proviso is to the effect that not more than one member of the Executive may be chosen from the same Canton.

The President and Vice-President of the Federal Council are selected by the united representatives from its own members, for the period of one year. After the lapse of that time, neither of these Presidents of the Confederacy can be re-elected for the immediately following twelvemonth. Literally speaking, it will thus be seen, the Swiss Executive is simply a Parliamentary Committee, with a chairman and vice-chairman appointed by, and responsible to, the combined House of Deputies and Senate. It is the true pyramidal form of a Democratic commonwealth.

The further enactment that no President or Vice-President of the Confederacy (or more correctly speaking, of the Executive Council of the Confederacy) can be re-elected for the twelvemonth following his term of office, is, of course, meant as a guarantee against any possible overweening ambition of a dictatorially in-

clined leader. Again, it is enacted that if a renovation of the National-Rath should have to take place by fresh elections, a completely new election of the Executive must follow.

By this method of choosing the head, or heads, of the Swiss government, all appeals to the passions of the mass of the people are avoided; and all undue personal ambition is kept in check or stifled in its birth. America has a four years' Presidency, with a previous deep and often violent agitation of the country. Switzerland has the *one* year's Chairmanship in the Federal Council; but the careful and truly representative procedure in her election method insures quiet.

A vast country like the United States of America may probably do well by giving to the Presidential office a longer term than the one in Switzerland. But as to the mode of appointing the Executive and its Foreman or President, I hold that the Swiss custom, as in the reformed constitution of 1848, is the preferable one.

It need scarcely be said that the national representation of a republic which has such a watchful eye has also reserved to itself the appointment of the Federal Court of Justice, of the Federal Chancellor, of the commander of the army, of the Chief of the Staff, and of the diplomatic envoys. A standing army is not kept in Switzerland. Every man, however, is liable to military service for the Confederation from the age of 20 to the completed age of 44. In some of the cantons this liability extends for cantonal purposes even much longer. Thus, in the constitution of Grisons it was laid down that, in so far as the Federal constitution did not provide otherwise, the liability to bear arms should extend from the seventeenth to the sixtieth year. Whilst the Confederacy, as such, is not to keep any standing army, the several cantons are not allowed, without special permission of the Federal government, to keep more than 300 men, in each canton.

In the elections for the National-Rath, or House of Deputies of all Switzerland, every Swiss is entitled to vote who has completed his twentieth year. For every twenty thousand inhabitants there is one representative. The suffrage is a direct one. Every Swiss is also eligible as a member of that House; naturalized citizens only after five years. Non-eligibility to the National-Rath is only decreed for the members of the Stände-Rath, or Senate, its officials, and the clergy. In the elections to the Senate the special suffrage methods of each canton come into operation.

In the average, it is manhood suffrage which prevails. The exceptions as to the right of voting mostly refer to those who live on alms, to bankrupts, to persons under guardianship, and to criminals. There is, however, a great variety in the various cantons as to the age at which a man becomes entitled to the suffrage. The constitutions I have before me fix it mostly at 20. But there are cantons in which the age of 21, 22, even 25, and on the other hand, the age of 19, 18, nay, 17, is mentioned as the one which entitles to the vote. In the eastern canton of Grisons liability to military service and the right of suffrage begin at the early age of 17. The assumption is that the man who may be called upon to sacrifice his life for the country, should also have a voice in the affairs of the commonwealth.

In several of the central or inner cantons, also, the early age of 18 or 19 is fixed for the elector. In that part of Switzerland there exists, to this day, the ancient institution of the *Lands-Gemeinde*, or full public assembly of the citizens. It is held in the open air for the discussion of the concerns of the community. The constitutions of the cantons in question declare that the sovereignty of the people is vested in the Lands-Gemeinde. In central Switzerland the priestly element yet maintains much of its influence; and it is not unlikely that very young men may be kept under the control of the Romanist priesthood.

In some of the cantons we come upon a shred of Solonic precept or law. Thus, in St. Gall, paragraph 20 of the ground-law says: "Every citizen who has the suffrage is in duty bound to visit the communal assemblies held in accordance with the constitution. Every eligible citizen is in duty bound to accept an office conferred upon him, by election, through the communal assemblies, and to serve in it for the legal term of its duration." This liability to the acceptance of a public office recurs in various cantonal constitutions. In the ground-law of the canton of Grisons, article 17 provides: "Every citizen who has the suffrage is bound to take part in plebiscites and elections referring to either federal or cantonal affairs. The law fixes the exceptional cases as well as the punishment in case of contravention."

III.

In the United States of America, however excellent its constitution in other respects may be, there is, I believe, still a faint

trace of the monarchical traditions of Europe. On truly democratic principles, the executive power ought to issue from the legislative power, and should constantly remain accountable to the latter. But in the American Union the President is elected outside the legislative power. Hence he appears to be equal to the latter, in some respects even above it; and the possibility of a conflict is thus furnished.

In France, after the overthrow of King Louis Philippe in 1848, the example of the United States was followed in the main by the introduction of a four years' presidency. The head of the republic was elected by the direct vote of the masses; even the slight and somewhat fictitious barrier of an Electoral College. The outcome was a deplorable one, owing to the strong monarchial traditions among the ignorant peasant population. France paid for the mistake by a political slavery extending to 1870, when the Bonapartean empire collapsed in a war begun "with a light heart."

Had the advice of M. Grévy prevailed in 1848 things might have turned out very differently. He whom the irony of fate lifted to the presidential office in 1879 for seven years had proposed, soon after the revolution of February, that Parliament should appoint a head of the Executive, who might at any moment be removed by a parliamentary vote—even like a prime minister. This proposition certainly went too far. It was somewhat apt to deprive the government of a desirable degree of stability. At any rate it did not sin in the opposite direction of giving an ambitious personage, whom the wild clamor of an unenlightened multitude might carry into the presidential office, a chance of overthrowing the republic by force of arms, as was done on that fatal night of December 2, 1851.

Our old friend Louis Blanc also was of the opinion, in 1848, that there should be no presidential office at all. He announced his proposition in the following words: "In the French republic, founded on February 24, 1848, there will be no President." Before he could, however, develop his thesis in Parliament, he became a refugee under a false accusation, launched against him, of being implicated in a previous seditious rising, with which, in reality, he had had no concern whatever. In an Appendix to his "*Revélations Historiques,*" Louis Blanc explains what he held to be the danger to Republican freedom from a President elected by the masses. He thought such a ruler would

regard his own title superior to that of every representative of the people ; and he might, therefore, be under the temptation of using the military power for the overthrow of the commonwealth.

The arguments given by Louis Blanc were quite correct, considering the state of things in a country which had only just achieved its emancipation from monarchial rule, and in which a number of dynastic Pretenders had to be feared. Unfortunately, he himself committed the grave error of pleading for the admission of Louis Bonaparte as a member of the National Assembly, contrary to the wiser counsels of Lamartine and Ledru-Rollin. It was from a feeling of "Republican generosity" that the historian of the French Revolution put forth this plea. In all probability he was also influenced by Louis Bonaparte's semi-Socialistic professions of a desire to bring about the "Extinction of Pauperism"—an idea with which the crafty Pretender played in those days, and which had induced the young Socialistic writer to pay him a friendly visit in the prison-fortress of Ham.

In London, Louis Blanc once showed me this pamphlet on the "Extinction of Pauperism," of which Louis Bonaparte was the author, and which had on the title-page a personal inscription containing some words of sympathetic dedication to our friend. It was a painful souvenir at a time when France was under the Napoleonic Reign of Terror, and Louis Blanc an exile.

The third French republic acted more prudently in the matter of the Presidency than the second one. It took Switzerland as its model in regard to the way of electing the chief magistrate of the country. In the summer of 1848, when France was in the throes of an internal convulsion, being occupied also with elaborating a new constitution, that reformed Swiss ground-law had not yet been publicly proclaimed. Even had its draft been more generally known, it is to be feared that in the state of public opinion in France at that time there would have been little inclination to follow the example of the small Alpine commonwealth.

Happily, it was otherwise after France had gone through sore despotic oppression. The lesson taught by Switzerland having at last been learnt by France, her new republican institutions have been maintained up to the present, for twenty-one years—a longer time of existence than any Republican, Imperial, or Royalist government has had since the days of the great Revolution of 1789.

KARL BLIND.

QUARANTINE AT NEW YORK.

BY WILLIAM T. JENKINS, M. D., HEALTH OFFICER, PORT OF NEW YORK.

IT WAS somewhere about the end of July or the beginning of August that I wrote to Washington for two copies of the hydrographic maps of the world. One of these was fastened on a wooden back and hung up in the boat-house on the Quarantine wharf. Here, day by day, the march of the cholera was marked, as it came to me from the reports in the newspapers. The typhus fever which had broken out in New York in the spring had passed Quarantine one week before I took hold of the work, and almost my first order was to disinfect all baggage belonging to Russian immigrants. On August 19 I heard there was cholera in Germany, and I telegraphed the Hon. J. W. Foster, Acting Secretary of State, asking him to investigate the story through the American consuls. On August 25 I received a dispatch from him saying the disease had been in Hamburg since the 18th. I answered at once asking that all emigrants to this country from infected ports or cities be detained by the consuls from five to eight days in order that the disease might have a chance to show itself. While these orders were, I believe, given by the State Department, they were not obeyed.

As the stories of cholera on the other side became more and more alarming, that we would have cases of it appear among the immigrants became certain. It was an anxious time for all who had the health of the people in their charge, and to none more than to me who stood on guard at the principal port of entry in this country. Many suggestions were made to me, among others that I should lay an embargo of ten days on all commerce. This I declined to do.

The first cholera ship—the disease appearing as cholerine in

the records on board—which arrived was the "Moravia." She had had twenty-four cases and twenty-two deaths, or about 92 per cent. of mortality. Of those attacked two women got well. After the arrival of the ship one other fatal case occurred, slightly raising the percentage of death.

It is not necessary here to tell the story of the cholera ships that arrived at this port, for that story is still fresh in the minds of all. Suffice it to say that the "Moravia" was followed by the "Rugia," the "Normannia," the "Scandia," the "Bohemia," the "Heligoland," and the "Wyoming," each having the disease on board. Hoffman Island being crowded, saloon passengers were transferred to the steamboat "Stonington," provided through the kindness of Mr. E. D. Morgan. Fire Island was purchased by Governor Flower at my suggestion, and, after many delays, the passengers were put there. The United States Government, at my request, handed over the "New Hampshire," and provided Camp Low. The disease was gradually stamped out, and ships began to arrive with clean bills of health until finally the so-called "cholera scare" was over. This brief abstract of what happened will serve to bring the story back to my readers' minds. In all there were 158 cases on the ships, distributed as follows: "Moravia," 25; "Rugia," 33; "Normannia," 20; "Scandia," 48; "Bohemia," 27; "Heligoland," 2; "Wyoming," 3.

In the case of the "Normannia" (and also of all the other cholera ships) the first thing done was to collect some of the *dejecta* of the sick and give it to the bacteriologists for examination. They pronounced the disease to be Asiatic cholera, as they found the distinctive bacillus. Without waiting for their report, however, the active work of stamping the disease out began.

The steamship was ordered to Lower Quarantine, and all sick, as well as all suspects, were transferred to the hospitals on Swinburne Island. The dead were also landed. I gave instructions to the officers of the ship to have all the drinking water boiled before it was used, and I notified the Hamburg-American Packet Company to send down water boats, so that a supply of Croton water might be on board. I also directed the officers to be careful to see that nothing was thrown overboard. The company sent down a transfer boat, and all the immigrants, with their baggage, were landed on Hoffman Island. Dr. Sanborn, one of

the most experienced assistants on my staff and a man who knew exactly what to do, took up his residence on board the steamship. It is largely owing to his efforts, I think, that everything went on as well as it did.

I got from the Hamburg-American Packet Company a full supply of disinfectants. I ordered all bedding soiled by the *dejecta* of the sick to be rolled up in sheets which had been dipped in a solution of bichloride of mercury, and the bundles so made to be thrown into the furnaces under the boilers. Then the compartments in which the sick had been were washed down with this solution in the most thorough manner. All packages of freight were washed outside in the same way, and the steamer itself was washed everywhere with this solution. The bilge water was pumped out and replaced with fresh sea water having the bichloride in it. The washing down of the ship with the solution was repeated every day while she lay in quarantine. The steerage deck was closed and caulked, and steam turned in for two hours. The heat was so great that it started the tar in the deck seams above. When this was finished the steerage and hold were shut up, and sulphur, in proportion of three pounds per thousand cubic feet, was burned, the fumes being allowed to remain between decks for five hours. This completed the treatment of the ship itself, and it was repeated with each that arrived.

The sick and suspects were removed to Swinburne Island, where the former were treated in the hospitals and the latter carefully watched. The number of sick taken there was 63 ; of suspects, 95 ; deaths among the sick, 20 ; among suspects, 3. The dead were removed at night in order to save the feelings of the living and were cremated.

All of the immigrants from the "Normannia" were taken to Hoffman Island. Here they were stripped and bathed thoroughly in salt water, to which bichloride of mercury, 1 to 5,000, had been added. The baths were at the normal temperature of the water at the end of August. After being thoroughly scrubbed, they wrapped themselves in blankets and waited for their clothes. These had been placed in the steam disinfecting boxes and submitted to a heat over 212° for four hours. This treatment will kill any known germs of disease. The baggage of all the immigrants was unpacked, each article shaken out and put into the

steam. The crews of the steamships were treated in the same way as the immigrants. As no cases had appeared among the saloon passengers, the only thing done with them was to have their baggage washed down with the bichloride solution and to keep them, with those in the steerage, in quarantine until all danger had passed.

The treatment of the "Normannia" and those on board of her was repeated with every steamship which arrived with the cholera on board. In the case of the "Moravia," "Scandia" and "Bohemia," as there was no room on Hoffman Island, I was forced to have the immigrants treated on board the ships, the bathing going on in a sail suspended by the four corners and filled with the sea water into which the bi-chloride had been put. The clothing was then disinfected by steam in a close compartment on the steamer.

It is a peculiarity of Americans that they never lock the stable until after the horse has been stolen. Naturally, then, the Quarantine service of the port of New York was utterly unprepared for the unprecedented work so suddenly thrust on it. I had neither men, boats, hospitals, pavilions for the well, money or anything else sufficient for the emergency, and I was forced to do what I could with the help I could get on the moment. Most fortunately for me and for the people I was able to secure the services, as consultant, of Dr. Geo. M. Sternberg, Deputy Surgeon General of the United States Army, than whom there is no man in this country more thoroughly cognizant of the treatment of contagious diseases. I am glad to have an opportunity to thank him. I had when the "Moravia" arrived about $7,000 in the treasury, and although I do not yet know, for to this date (October 10) the books have not yet been made up, I imagine I have run into debt. The Hon. Hugh J. Grant, Mayor of New York, sent me word that I could call on him for money if I needed it during the anxious time, and I am none the less obliged to him because I did not ask for it.

The needs of the quarantine of the port of New York, in order to meet any future inroad of disease threatening the whole country, are not very many. There should be an island constructed between Hoffman and Swinburne Islands having an area of ten acres. This would not cost much beyond the spiling and the rip-rap. The water is shoal, and all ships coming here in ballast could be re-

quired to dump there. On this island, when made, a pavilion large enough to hold 1,000 people should be built, together with disinfecting apparatus and the various outhouses. I can now accommodate 500 or 600 people in the hospitals on Swinburne Island, and 1,000 on Hoffman Island if it be necessary. This new island—I should call it Flower Island, if I could, in memory of Governor Flower's speech on politics and health—would give all the necessary space.

There should be purchased by the State one fast tug for the Health officer to make his rounds in, one boarding tug for the use of the assistants, one large transfer boat to move immigrants in, and one hospital boat for the sick and suspects. These should be kept in Quarantine all the time and should be for quarantine purposes only. I should not object to lending the hospital boat, when not needed, to such associations as St. John's Guild in the summer time, providing, of course, they paid the expenses. But, when needed, these boats should be ready for Quarantine service, for it is impossible to arrange a hospital boat in a week. If we should have another outbreak of the cholera in Europe next spring—as is very probable—these boats may be badly needed.

There should be an emergency fund of at least $50,000 deposited in some bank apart from the regular funds of Quarantine. This money should not be touched, even when, under the present scale of fees, the Quarantine expenditures run ahead of the receipts. It should be subject to the check of the Health officer, indorsed by the Governor, but only when one or more ships having cases of contagious disease on board should arrive in this port.

In case the new island should be made, it would be well, if possible, to dredge a channel for an ocean steamship to a wharf to be constructed on it. This would do away with the necessity of a transfer boat. While I would like to see this done, it is not in my opinion absolutely necessary. The other things suggested are necessary and as to the money, the need of that is imperative. Disease will not, unfortunately, regulate its appearance by the sessions of the Legislature.

The present fees charged are, in cases where ships having contagious disease on board arrive in this port, little else than ridiculous. For example, the fee for disinfecting a ship is $5, and with the largest ocean steamships but two fees can be charged.

In other words, the steamship pays the Quarantine service $10, and the very lowest cost of disinfecting the steamship properly is about $150.

When the fees were much larger than at present the annual appropriation made by the Legislature was $200,000. The appropriation last year was $20,000. In 1890 my predecessor, Dr. Smith, who managed the Quarantine service with the greatest economy, found himself $1,200 behind when the yearly accounts were made up.

The necessity for money during such a time as that which I have recently passed through is perfectly obvious. Ordinarily, two physicians, in addition to the Health officer, are sufficient for the service. Were Flower Island built, and should cholera or any other contagious disease come to this port, it would be necessary to increase this number to at least ten. During the last two months I have had eleven physicians. In addition to the ten physicians there should be ten disinfectors, the captains, engineers and crews of the hospital and transfer boats, nurses, cooks, engineers in charge of the steam apparatus on the islands, laborers, etc., etc. Now while all these can be got, and while the companies furnish a certain number of men, money is needed for them and for the supplies.

It must be remembered that, New York being the principal port of entry in the United States, it is through this gate that contagious disease enters. It is the duty of the State, with this terrible responsibility on it, to see that nothing is left undone that will make the guard sure and certain. I am assured that this duty need only be pointed out, and the necessities of Quarantine explained, to have all that is necessary done.

The last three months has been an anxious time for me; it is impossible for me to say how anxious. During that time I have been supported by the press, by public officers, and by public associations in a way and to an extent that I am most sincerely thankful for. Not only have they lightened the crushing weight on my shoulders and relieved the terrible responsibility resting on me in the most material way, but their sympathy and good will have comforted me in many an hour of painful thought. I cannot let this opportunity pass without placing on record my sincere gratitude to them.

Nor can I refrain from expressing my deep sense of obliga

tion to the Governor of the State of New York, the Mayor of the city of New York, President Martin and Superintendent Byrnes of the Police, President Cram of the Dock Commission, and President Wilson of the Board of Health. These gentlemen have afforded invaluable aid without obstructing the work of quarantine.

For myself, confronted with a great danger to my countrymen and feeling that on me rested the responsibility of managing the first line of defence against the disease, I can only say I have done my very best in the position in which I found myself. I have made mistakes, I know, and were the occasion to come again I might do differently in some things. It is for my fellow citizens to say if I have done well.

WILLIAM T. JENKINS.

WANTED, A NEW PARTY.

BY T. V. POWDERLY.

IN THE canvass of 1884 the cry that sounded louder than the tariff was "Turn the rascals out." Those who were not inclined to use so harsh a term expressed themselves in favor of a change. "We want a change" was heard on all sides, and the people voted for a change. Those who did not want a change were holding office, and they were about the only ones who experienced much of a change when the Democracy entered upon its four years of life. Whether the rascals were turned out or not, it is certain that the people turned the Democracy out again in 1888. It is safe to say that the change effected in the revolution of 1884 did not affect the nation, as was expected, or a change back to the old party would not have taken place in such a short time.

A glance at the platforms of the two old parties this year will not disclose a very startling difference; they are both framed to catch as many votes as possible, and both express sympathy for the Jews in Russia and the Irish in Ireland, but they scrape the skies for lofty, high-sounding terms in which to describe American affairs, ignoring the fact that there are Americans in this land who do not want sympathy, but who do demand relief from the exactions of monopoly. The Jews, the world over, control a great deal of wealth; they are worth courting, and as kind words and sympathy cost nothing, a political platform may as well express a little sympathy as not. The Irish are not so well off as the Jews, but they have a greater number of votes to bestow, and surely an expression of smpathy with the Irish—in Ireland—can do no harm. It is understood, of course, that the principle at stake in Russia and Ireland is what determined the platform-makers to lavish their sympathy, and if the Jews could be cajoled into contributing to campaign funds and the Irish induced to

give their votes, the sympathy would, in the end, prove a paying investment. It is to be hoped that the Jews and the Irish in the United States are Americans, and that such transparent bids for support will not sway them in voting. There are Jews and Irish in the United States, and, as they are more liable to feel the effects of the coming elections, they, in common with other voters, are the ones to receive consideration now.

The tariff is the one issue between the Republican and Democratic parties; all other issues are incidental and of secondary consideration. In Tennessee there are miners, many of them natives of Ireland, who are starving because the rogues, murderers and rascals of that State have been turned out of the penitentiaries to take their places in the mines. The foremost men of both parties are the holders of the infamous leases under which the convicts are kept in the places of honest men. If sincerity had an abiding place in the hearts of these platform builders they would have bestowed some of their sympathy on the workmen of Tennessee. Natives of European countries were members of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers last July; they were also citizens of the United States; they were guaranteed the right to bear arms and use them in defence of themselves and of the State. A foreign force invaded the State, the workmen of Homestead repulsed them and in doing so used violence which would not have been necessary had the officers of the law regarded their oaths of office as being more than mere title deeds to position. At Buffalo later on we saw a railroad company, owned by English capital, setting at defiance the laws of the State of New York. We saw switchmen strike against the outrage upon the law. We saw the blaze arise from a train of disabled, but well-insured, freight cars and heard the roar of censure which swept over the land. Then the troops went to Buffalo. We saw the outbreak at Cœur d'Alene; we saw the flagrant violations of law, on both sides.

In all of these scenes we witnessed the introduction of a power which usurps that of the people, an authority which sets itself higher than constitutions and law—the Judiciary. Where no law exists a judicial decision will dovetail into the case and a Judge can always be found who owes his ermine to the votes which were purchased for him by corporate wealth. We hear the cry against the importation of the handiwork of foreigners, while all the time the

foreigners themselves come in duty free to take the places of American workmen. Neither party utters an earnest, sincere protest against the invasion. We hear a wail for the Jews who are outraged by the Czar, and the Irish who are forced to give up the last grain of wheat to pay the rent, but the more autocratic and dangerous, because more insidious, power of our American Czar goes unnoticed. Neither party proclaims its devotion to the best interests of the American people by demanding that the railroads, the public highways, shall become the property of the government. Neither party declares in favor of government ownership of telegraphs and telephones. If there is a power which stands a menace to the perpetuity of American institutions, that power is vested in the managers of the railroads and telegraphs of the nation. With the avenues of transportation of passengers, freight and intelligence in the grasp of a few selfish men, it is expecting too much of human nature to suppose that anything higher than counting dividends will occupy the attention of the owners of these concerns.

Behind the railways and telegraphs stands the Judiciary, ready and willing to lend its awful strength to that now exercised by corporate wealth, so that the combination may strike terror to the hearts of the men who must work for bread. Vest the title to the rail and telegraph lines in the government and we destroy the incentive to own judges and courts. Every well-regulated railroad corporation now owns its judges and courts; one of the necessary adjuncts to the great corporation of the day is a court of its own, or a number of them. It is cheaper to buy judges to set aside laws than it is to pay a number of legislators to make laws; besides it is safer and attracts less attention. We make law, and it is laughed at by the trust, the syndicate and the combine; we make appeals to courts and governors, and our appeals are laughed at and pigeon-holed, or else a mock trial is entered upon to deceive and lull the majority to the sleep of death. We elect judges and they stand guard at the portals of monopoly. We turn to parties that have for a hundred years made promises, and they feed us on more promises. They assert that they will arrest the march of monopoly, but we must not forget that that march was begun under their sheltering wing, and that it has assumed its colossal proportions under their fostering care. Side by side with the

Democratic and Republican parties has monopoly grown; they begot it; they fed it until it became strong enough to feed them, and it is the height of folly to expect that the creator will destroy the creature on which it fattens.

At Omaha it was hoped by many that Judge Gresham would accept the nomination for the Presidency from the People's party. A Republican, one prominent in the councils of his party in days gone by, wrote me on the eve of that convention:

"The useful work of the Republican and Democratic parties has been done, and the time has come for the people to rise and make a new party. . . . I have done all I could to force the Republican party to become the party of the people. There is no use in making effort to correct either of the old parties."

The writer of that is a millionaire; he bears a name honored in American history and means what he says. Another gentleman, very wealthy, wrote as follows:

"In forming a new party, it is important, while clearly defining leading principles, not to erect fences which will shut out a multitude of people who might otherwise desire to be with you."

He then gives a brief draft of a platform and adds:

"But having gone so far, do not permit the tacking on of unnecessary incumbrances—the less detail the better. Ten men will read a platform of a thousand words to one who will go over one of the usual length. . . . Choose a man like Gresham, if possible, for standard bearer. If he will accept, please say to him that I beg to place at his disposal a check for $1,000 towards his personal expenses during the campaign."

Hundreds of other men in like circumstances in life expressed similar sentiments. There are thousands, not obliged to do manual labor, who feel the same way; they long for a change, not from the rule of Republicanism to that of Democracy—so called—but to a new and honest party which will grapple in earnest with the evils which threaten our country. This may not be the year to elect such a candidate, but it is the year to inaugurate the movement which will place such a party in power later on, and every workingman, every thinking man, and every patriot should cast his vote for the candidate of the People's party this year. That party aims at government ownership of railroads and telegraphs; it aims at establishing a pure and real democracy in the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum in legislation, and is therefore the real party of democracy in this campaign.

T. V. Powderly.

ARE THERE TOO MANY OF US?

BY PRESIDENT E. B. ANDREWS, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

THE scientific treatment of questions touching population began with Thomas Robert Malthus. The first edition of his great work, "An Essay on the Principle of Population as It Affects the Future Improvement of Society, with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and Other Writers," appeared in 1798, as a polemic pamphlet. It was in part aimed at the vicious, pauperizing poor-law of England at that time; in part it was a criticism upon the superficial optimism of those writers who had been carried away by the vaporings of Rousseau and other French Revolutionary philosophers. Malthus's own father was one of these. Godwin, to whom the title of the Essay refers, was another. Political equality and commercial freedom, they argued, would in a little while produce a perfectly happy society. Vice and misery were at once to disappear and the millenium to dawn, if only the fine doctrines of the Revolution, of the Physiocrats, of Adam Smith, could get themselves realized.

Malthus opposed this pleasing view on the ground that such ideal social weal is and necessarily must be hindered by the very conditions of life, population inevitably tending to increase more rapidly than subsistence and the possibility of general welfare. In its later editions, of which no less than seven appeared during the author's lifetime, the Essay casts off its polemic form and becomes a mere dissertation. But the essential thought is unchanged; human beings tend to multiply faster than food can be provided for them. Malthus represented the difference as that between arithmetical and geometrical ratio, population multiplying as the series 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, and so on, production swelling meantime only as the series 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and so on. He, however, laid no stress on the exactness or the mathematical

expressibility of his law, but only on the validity of it as a general truth.

Malthus does not allege that population in fact increases thus rapidly, but that it tends to do so, and would, were it not for certain checks. They are of two classes: the moral or preventive, and the positive or repressive. The preventive checks include everything that helps keep human life from originating when it would otherwise do so. The positive consist in whatever kills off our species, as wars, famines, vices, pestilences and ordinary disease. Had Malthus lived later he would doubtless have noticed more fully than he did the agency of social custom in nullifying for men the law of the survival of the physically fittest, propagating bodily disorders probably to a far greater extent than hygiene and medicine avail in the contrary direction. But the checks which he names are numerous and powerful, so much so, he thinks, that, without their incessant working through all past time, the world would long ago have been overrun.

Nearly all the countless attempts to refute Malthus, instead of doing this, practically fall in with his theory, merely emphasizing more or less the activity of his checks. Thus, Herbert Spencer, in urging that the physical nature grows less imperious as culture advances,* is simply pointing out how the preventive check applies itself. Bastiat showed that the same advance of culture, making parents unwilling that their children should be worse off than they, works a voluntary, or truly moral application of the preventive check. Neither of these tendencies, however, is operative upon the vast masses of mankind, in reference to whom the great problem is to get them under the influence of culture. Of the very poor, only the positive checks keep down the numbers. Malthus's second edition significantly differs from the first in admitting a far larger hope from moral self-restraint as one of the preventive checks. In this change Malthus does not, as Bagehot argues, "cut away the ground of his whole argument." The peculiar check in question may exist and act, widely and beneficently, yet over vast multitudes of human kind totally fail of effect.

In spite of all these checks, Malthus maintains, population tends to outrun subsistence. Some men must always be needy. As a matter of fact, he says, checks of the one kind or the other are in every nation, past or present, what has kept population

* Biology, pt. vi.

down to food. Darwin declares that in reading "Malthus On Population" he became impressed "that natural selection was the inevitable result of the rapid increase of all organic beings"; and he admits his now famous theory to be but "the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms." With men as with brutes, it is a fight for life. The social bliss for which we sigh is not to be had so cheaply as Rousseau and Godwin said. Great continence is a human duty. No man has a right to bring children into the world unless he has a fair prospect of ability to support them.

As Malthus laid no stress on the exactness of his alleged progressions we do not refute him by showing those progressions inexact. The question is, have they a truth, or truths, at bottom?

The assumption of a geometrical ratio as the law of humanity's numerical increase is a good way from the fact. We will not quarrel over the question whether it is not absurd to speak at all of a "natural" rate of increase for human beings. In his assumption of a "natural rate" Malthus seemed to be thinking how swiftly life would replenish the earth if all checks were away.* But disease and death are natural, and just what pressure of them shall we call a check? We must not confound the "natural tendency" of men to increase with the abstract physiological possibility of numerous births; nor is it the same to allege a tendency to too great increase, and to say that, all things considered, there is a danger, since a certain increase, if well distributed, might be for centuries no curse, but a blessing.

Malthus took as his norm to go by a young country, the United States, where all was in the highest degree favorable to great prolificacy. He derived his figures from Benjamin Franklin's "Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind and the Peopling of Colonies," 1751, one of his earliest works. As he stated, our population was, when Malthus wrote, doubling at the rate of once in 25 years. We have never had a uniform registration of births and deaths, and our national census is taken once only in ten years; so that we cannot tell for any period the exact annual increment of population, or say how much is due to excess of births over deaths, and how much to immigration. The increase in the last decade of last century was 35.10 per cent., and for the first

*Such an order of things as Rümelin describes, "*Reden und Aufsaetze*," I, 320 seq. Cf. Uhland's beautiful poem, "*Ver Sacrum*."

decade of this 36.38 per cent., probably the most rapid gains in population from natural causes—for the immigration during these 20 years was but slight—of which we have any record. In these two decades there may easily have been, right along, 48 births per thousand inhabitants, and not over 28 deaths, giving a natural increase of more than three per cent. As the struggle for existence increases in severity, families diminish in size, marriages are less frequent, or entered into at a later age, and population does not grow so rapidly. Our progress as a nation is greatly due to the natural wealth of our country. Even now we have of persons over 70 only 14 in 1,000, where France has 37, while females within the 22 years of possible maternity, number 18 or 19 per cent., instead of 16, which is the average.

During the fifty years from 1790 to 1840 our population doubled twice. Between 1790 and 1885 Rhode Island doubled in population nearly two and a half times, or, exactly, increased 341.1 per cent. From 1880 to 1885 the gain was 10 per cent. The average per cent. of our entire national increase has been 32.7 per decade ever since 1790. Excluding the war decade it has been 33.95 per cent. Aside from the people who have come to us with territorial acquisition, we seem to have gained about 2.6 per cent. yearly ever since this century began. Between 1850 and 1880, we went from 23,191,876, to 50,155,783. That is, we more than doubled during those thirty years in spite of the war.

As a clergyman, Malthus may have been influenced in part by the Old Testament figures relating to the multiplication of the Israelites in Egypt. These captives occupied a fruitful land, with no hindrances to rapid growth, and were probably augmented by immigration from related tribes. They were in Egypt 430 years. The original colony had in Jacob with his sons and grandsons 70 male persons. After the exodus, according to Moses's census, there were 603,550 males 20 years old and upwards. By Euler's method they must have doubled once in about 30 years, involving a yearly increase of over 2 per cent.

But although Malthus could find a few instances of such swift growth, he had no right to generalize from them. A hundred years before his time, Europe was thought to double its population only once in two centuries.* Henry George, in his "Progress and Poverty," urges against Malthus the small number of the de-

* Sir Wm. Petty, "Political Arithmetic," ch. v.

scendants from Confucius. These, 2,150 years from their great ancestor's death, amounted to only about 22,000 souls, instead of 859,559,193,106,709,670,198,710,528, as they should have mustered had they doubled once in 25 years. With this may be coupled a consideration touching China at large. The Chinese as a people date back five thousand years at least. The country is five times as large as Germany, warmer and more fruitful than Europe. A great part of its soil produces two harvests yearly. The people raise few cattle, living mostly on vegetable food. Yet, owing to checks of some sort, of which probably infanticide, which is favored by law, may be regarded as the chief, the population there is less dense on the average than in Belgium, Saxony or England.

Europe has probably doubled its population in the last 100 years. Between 1820 and 1880 its population arose from 200 millions to 330 millions, a yearly increase of $\frac{8}{10}$ of one per cent. Our oldest statistics are for Sweden and reach back to 1750. Sweden's population was in 1752 1,785,727; in 1884, 4,644,448, a total increase of 160 per cent. over the figure at the first date named. Passing to the first third of this century we find Baden doubling its population only in 34 years, Hungary only in 38, Belgium in 42, Tuscany and Galicia in 43, Sardinia in 44. In none of the older nations has a yearly increase of 2 per cent. ever been reached, nor is there any likelihood of such a gain, at least for any length of time. France, at its present rate of gain, will need nearly, or quite, 300 years to double its population.

Never, in Europe, were the conditions for great increase better than from 1820 to 1870; yet the numbers only went in these years from about 200 millions to about 300 millions, or $\frac{8}{10}$ of one per cent. annual gain, and the nations which advanced the most rapidly have at no time doubled this rate. A doubling of population in 25 years, as was going on in the United States when Malthus was alive, is therefore no normal but a very abnormal phenomenon.

We know full well what Malthus would reply to this exhibit. He would hail it as a proof of his position, alleging as the reason for the slower gains enumerated, that the checks had been more active in Europe than in America. And, for substance of fact, he would be right. I only demur at his doctrinaire assump-

tion of the American figures as the more "normal." Checks are "normal," too; and, as already remarked, it is purely arbitrary to set down this or that exact pressure of them as preëminently the natural one. Only at extreme pressure does it seem to me reasonable to pronounce them pathological.

Malthus erred, not only as to the rate of human increase, but also as to its philosophy. He did not allow enough for barrenness, and he made the age of possible maternity too long. Also, he did not allow for the numerous pairs like Napoleon and Josephine, the parties unfruitful together, though able to be fruitful with others. Statistics show that the maternity period does not average over twenty-two years, and that about one-seventh of the married women are without children.* In every thousand human beings in any community there will average to be about 165 women of the maternity age 15 of them childless, leaving at most but 150 who will be mothers. To find the yearly increase of population per thousand, suppose each of the 150 to have three children in the 22 years. The average per year is then $\frac{150 \times 3}{22}$, which equals 20+, and the result is larger the more children there are to the family. If we assume 4, it is 27+; if 5, 34+; if 6, 41—; if 7, 48+; if 8, 54+, etc.

Over against such figure, whatever it is, we have to set the rate of mortality. This, under the most favorable conditions, is about 20 per thousand, annually, increasing somewhat according as the number of births swells.

In 1,000 persons, if the average number of children to a mother is three, just as many persons will die as are born. If mothers have four each, 27 will be born while 22 die. And so on. Malthus supposed that an average of four children per family would double the population every 25 years. On the contrary, seven per family would double it only in 35 years. The people of Rhode Island, where, in 1885, on an average, 4.27 children were born to each mother, would at that rate need a century and a quarter to double. This, of course, takes no account of immigration.

It was obvious that Malthus was far astray at least regarding the form of his law. From our better statistics we can correct

* Rümelin, "*Reden und Aufsaetze*," I., 312 ff. I am indebted to this learned author for most of my figures relating to Europe.

him. The natural rate of multiplication, if we admit such a notion, could not even by Malthus's own principles have been greater in his time than in the years covered by our best recent statistics, because material prosperity has been improving meanwhile. If the rate assigned by him is now too great, it certainly was then.

Yet Malthus is correct in urging that men tend to multiply with decided rapidity. It is universally recognized that a stationary population is abnormal, a sign of disease. The rule is advance.

We saw that the rate per cent. of increase in the United States, including immigration, has been 32.70 per decade ever since 1790. Unless immigration is checked, it is hardly likely to fall off at present or for 100 years. But even supposing the rate to be 30 per cent. per decade, the population by 1990 will be 898,207,250, which, without new territory, would give us 299.3 inhabitants to the square mile. We should then have a denser population than the British Isles to-day; and while we could not even so be said to have reached a limit of population fully taxing the supporting power of our territory, our people could not look forward to still further expansion without apprehension.

Europe's population, doubling in the last 100 years, has gained about $\frac{7}{10}$ of one per cent. yearly. For the last 60 years of relatively accurate records, the gain in several of the European states, England, Prussia, and the Scandinavian lands, has been 1 per cent. or more yearly, in spite of emigration, and the average has not been under $\frac{5}{10}$ of one per cent. in any normal year. We may then take this $\frac{1}{2}$ of one per cent. as the normal minimum.

At 1 per cent. annual increase Germany in the year 2000 would have 160 million inhabitants. In two centuries from now it would have 300 millions, and in three centuries 650 millions. Europe would have at the same rate in two centuries from now 2,300 million inhabitants, and in three centuries 4,800 millions. The last figure would require not much short of 2,000 people to live on a square mile—an impossibility under anything like present economic arrangements.

But take the actual minimum normal rate of one-half of one per cent. annual increase. At this, in 280 years, Europe will have 1,300,000,000 inhabitants. By the real present rate the increase would be much faster, giving 600 millions in about 80

years, 25, 30 or 40 millions in excess of the present. Even with one-third of one per cent. Germany would in 1,000 years from now have 1,200 millions, and in 2,000 years, 36 billions. Even France, at its rate of progress in the last 60 years, 2.3 per thousand, yearly, which is the smallest in Europe, would in 500 years have 300 million souls; just about 2,000 to every square mile.

It is instructive to apply backward the present rate of increase in Europe's population. Taking the minimum normal of $\frac{1}{2}$ of one per cent. a year and reckoning it back to about the beginning of the 5th century A. D., we should make the population of Europe then to have been only half a million. But Wietersheim carefully estimates the population of the European parts of the Roman Empire in the 2d century A. D. as 45 millions. Now, after seventeen hundred years, there are only 156 millions, a yearly increase of only $\frac{7}{1000}$ of one per cent., or $\frac{7}{10}$ of one in a thousand, and a doubling-period of 950 years.

Malthus's assumption as to the relatively slow and difficult manner in which men's food supply has to be increased was a good deal nearer the truth than what he wrote about the growth of population, but he did not see with any clearness the real nature of the law which he was approaching.

The law, according to which production in general advances, is: The more capital and labor applied to nature, the more product. In agriculture, however, and with certain modifications, in mining, another law evidently prevails, which has been denominated the law of diminishing return, to the effect that in the long run, increased application of labor and capital fails to command a proportionate increase of return. It is this law of diminishing return in agriculture which forms the stern significance of the Malthusian doctrine. Its operation may be postponed, and the reverse law of increasing return be set in action for a time. Addition to population will have this tendency up to a certain limit, by making possible a fuller division of labor. Improved agricultural machines and methods will work in the same way; as it will also to bring, in a new country, more fertile land under cultivation. To have demonstrated this point is the great merit of the late Henry C. Carey. But the operation of these causes cannot continue forever; the general law under which soil is tilled is the one named, the law of diminishing return.

So that while Malthus did not hit the truth with any exact-

ness, the principle for which he was so vaguely feeling is, when found, a true one, over which it were far more seemly to look sober than to laugh.

It is a fact that population would, in a thousand localities, soon outstrip the means of feeding it, if it were not kept down by vice, misery, or self-restraint. In a state of society where self-restraint does not act at all, or only so little that we need not think of it, population will augment till the poorest class have only just enough to support life. In a community where self-restraint acts effectually, each class of the community will augment till it reaches the point when it begins to exercise that restraint.* Do not infer from this that the self-restraining communities are as likely to occur as the others. That would indeed be a negation of Malthusianism, but it is contrary to fact, so hard is it to bring restraint to act on the masses of the people.

"So long as unlimited multiplication goes on, no social organization which has ever been devised, or is likely to be devised, no fiddle-faddling with the distribution of wealth, will deliver society from the tendency to be destroyed by the reproduction within itself, in its intensest form, of that struggle for existence, the limitation of which is the object of society. And however shocking to the moral sense this eternal competition of man against man or of nation against nation may be; however revolting may be the accumulation of misery at the negative pole of society, in contrast with that of monstrous wealth at the positive pole, this state of things must abide, and grow continually worse, so long as Istar holds her way unchecked. It is the true riddle of the Sphinx; and every nation which does not solve it will sooner or later be devoured by the monster itself has generated." †

Malthus's recommendations are in substance still needed. Though, perhaps, no country can yet be said to be saturated with population, many localities, great cities especially, are so. It boots nothing to know that none die from the niggardliness of nature in the strict sense, which is true if you take large areas, so as not to light on famine spots; because the maladjustments of society are, even in Malthus's own discussion, conceived as practically part of nature. The exhortation should, however, be modified, to the effect that the able, intelligent, well to do,

* Bagehot, "Economic Studies," 139.
† Huxley, "*Nineteenth Century*," February, 1888, p. 169.

especially such as can instruct and lead, may even have a duty to propagate. There is nothing in Malthusianism, or in the fact of life, to render appropriate a crusade in favor of universal celibacy.*

A Malthusian law there is, which cannot be set aside; though it may offer, except in limited localities, nowise the present threat which many have seemed to see in it. Sometime it must take effect, the result being, not of course that humanity will starve, or even any part of it, but that either additional restraint must be applied, or a lessening *per capita* plenty will induce vices and diseases to which enough will succumb to let the others continue. The picture of a world starved to death is no legitimate suggestion of Malthusianism.

We may, of course, sip more or less comfort from such observations as these:

1. Only about one-sixth the cultivable land of the world is as yet occupied.

2. Infinitely greater saving is possible than has ever been exercised thus far, no one enjoying less in consequence.

3. Though food-getting will become harder and harder, the getting of other things, and especially such as minister to our higher life, is to be easier and easier as the æons pass. Bread-winning may become 100 times as difficult as now; if manufacturing becomes the same degree easier, humanity will get its whole living with no greater difficulty than now.

But no other course of thought so approaches a refutation of Malthus as that most recently made familiar by Henry George and Prince Kropotkin. Food, says George, springs not from agriculture alone, and non-vegetable food may be multiplied almost without limit by the free agency of man.

"Both the jay-hawk and the man eat chickens, but the more jay-hawks the fewer chickens, while the more men the more chickens. Both the seal and the man eat salmon, but when a seal takes a salmon there is a salmon less, and were seals to increase past a certain point salmon must diminish; while by placing the spawn of the salmon under favorable conditions man can so increase the number of salmon as to more than make up for all he may take, and thus, no matter how much men may increase, their increase never need outrun the supply of salmon."

The late Spencer F. Baird used to regard one acre of water

* Or to what is worse, recommended by an author whom Schaeffle cites, '*Bau und Leben*,' II., 256 seqq.

equal to seven of land in the production of food. Pressed with the consideration that chickens and salmon too must live upon food, of which the supply recedes, George rejoins that it cannot infinitely recede; that the universe of materials capable of sustaining life remains ever the same, however many times these materials may have aided in the sustenance of life up to any given date, and that the bounds of this universe have never yet been discovered. Kropotkin carries the thought into particulars, showing from examples and by the principles of chemistry the indefinite improvableness in the fertility of land.

Nothing could be more interesting than facts like these. They render it happily clear that, so far from approaching the limit of the earth's productivity, we have hardly broached it yet. There is to this planet an ability to bear life incalculably beyond what Malthus dreamed. But this, again, does not turn his contention into unreason. The anti-Malthusian line of argument just sketched is as illusory as it is interesting. It is very old as well—older, in fact, than Malthus. President James Madison in his younger days brilliantly explored it,* anticipating all the anti-Malthusians, and preceded Malthus and his aides in demonstrating its vanity.

Three hard facts confront us. One is that the earth's stock of substances capable of sustaining human life is, after all, limited. Another, that many of these are passing hopelessly beyond man's reach. The third is that such utilizing of plant nutrition as is intrinsically possible must forever increase in cost. Less and less fruitful soils must be brought into use, loam reclaimed from beneath the ocean, rocks pulverized, to make place for new land and the mechanical ingredients for artificial soil. And, at best, such soil cannot but be limited in amount, so expensive will be its manufacture. Kropotkin's cases can never be generalized, involving as they do the limitless carting of heavy stuffs from farms to towns and from towns to farms. This particular cause of decrease in agricultural returns will indeed weaken as population condenses, but cannot disappear, since people can never be scattered evenly over the land.

Meantime, the sons of men wax ever a greater host. Europe, with its 156 millions, increases by $\frac{7}{10}$ of one per cent. each year, threatening to have 600 millions by 1970, and 1,300 millions by

* Rives's "Life of Madison," vol. iii., 91, 94.

2150. Our own country, adding to its numbers by nearly 3 per cent. a year, bids fair to approach 90 millions by 1900.

Could such growth possibly continue, the failure of standing room would be but a matter of time. The entire globe measures about 600,000,000,000,000 square yards, or, allowing a yard as standing room for four persons, there is place for 2,400,000,000,000,000 persons. Now the population of England and Wales, which may be regarded as about normal for civilized lands, doubled between 1801 and 1851. At this rate population would in 100 years multiply itself by 4; in 200 by 16; in 1,000 by 1,000,000; and in 3,000 years by 1,000,000,000,000,000,000. So that, even if we begin with a single pair, the increase would in 3,000 years have become two quintillion human beings: viz., to every square yard 3,333⅓ persons instead of four. Or, the earth would be covered with men in columns of 833⅓ each, standing on each other's heads. If they averaged five feet tall, each column would be 4,166⅔ feet high.*

One cannot look forward to the far future of civilized society without solicitude. Reflect that the present population of Europe could, through an increase no greater than that now prevailing, have sprung from a half million souls living at 400 A. D., and that there were then in Europe at least 100 times this number, and probably more; then sweep mentally over the intervening history, noting in wars and pestilences some of the causes why the figures for Europe to-day read 156 millions instead of 15 billions 600 millions, and you will no longer laugh at Malthus.

Are the checks which must be applied in future, likely to be positive or preventive? If the latter, shall they be morally preventive or immorally preventive? A more momentous this-world question could hardly be asked. Let the masses remain ignorant and brutish, and human life will forever continue in threatening disproportion to food, progress and poverty side by side, the comfort of a few shadowed by wars and want and sicknesses on the part of multitudes. Only as character shall prevail can coming generations fill the ideal of an earthly society: human beings numerous enough to work the great cosmic field to the best advantage, yet voluntarily few enough to admit of a reasonable and decent subsistence for all. For man's body as for his soul, for time as for eternity, his only hope lies in spiritual elevation.

E. B. ANDREWS,

*Marshall, "Economics of Industry," book I., chap. v.

ERNEST RENAN.

BY COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

"Blessed are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well co-mingled
That they are not a pipe for fortune's finger
To sound what stop she please."

ERNEST RENAN is dead. Another source of light; another force of civilization; another charming personality; another brave soul, graceful in thought, generous in deed; a sculptor in speech, a colorist in words—clothing all in the poetry born of a delightful union of heart and brain—has passed to the realm of rest.

Reared under the influences of Catholicism, educated for the priesthood, yet by reason of his natural genius, he began to think. Forces that utterly subjugate and enslave the mind of mediocrity sometimes rouse to thought and action the superior soul.

Renan began to think—a dangerous thing for a Catholic to do. Thought leads to doubt, doubt to investigation, investigation to truth—the enemy of all superstition.

He lifted the Catholic extinguisher from the light and flame of reason. He found that his mental vision was improved. He read the Scriptures for himself, examined them as he did other books not claiming to be inspired. He found the same mistakes, the same prejudices, the same miraculous impossibilities in the book attributed to God that he found in those known to have been written by men.

Into the path of reason, or rather into the highway, Renan was led by Henriette, his sister, to whom he pays a tribute that has the perfume of a perfect flower.

"I was," writes Renan, "brought up by women and priests, and therein lies the whole explanation of my good qualities and of my defects." In most that he wrote is the tenderness of

woman, only now and then a little touch of the priest showing itself, mostly in a reluctance to spoil the ivy by tearing down some prison built by superstition.

In spite of the heartless "scheme" of things he still found it in his heart to say, "When God shall be complete, He will be just," at the same time saying that "nothing proves to us that there exists in the world a central consciousness—a soul of the universe—and nothing proves the contrary." So, whatever was the verdict of his brain, his heart asked for immortality. He wanted his dream, and he was willing that others should have theirs. Such is the wish and will of all great souls.

He knew the Church thoroughly and anticipated what would finally be written about him by churchmen: "Having some experience of ecclesiastical writers I can sketch out in advance the way my biography will be written in Spanish in some Catholic review, of Santa Fé, in the year 2,000. Heavens! how black I shall be! I shall be so all the more, because the Church when she feels that she is lost will end with malice. She will bite like a mad dog."

He anticipated such a biography because he had thought for himself, and because he had expressed his thoughts—because he had declared that "our universe, within the reach of our experiment is not governed by any intelligent reason. God, as the common herd understand him, the living God, the acting God—the God-Providence, does not show himself in the universe"—because he attacked the mythical and the miraculous in the life of Christ and sought to rescue from the calumnies of ignorance and faith a serene and lofty soul.

The time has arrived when Jesus must become a myth or a man. The idea that he was the infinite God must be abandoned by all who are not religiously insane. Those who have given up the claim that he was God, insist that he was divinely appointed and illuminated; that he was a perfect man—the highest possible type of the human race and, consequently, a perfect example for all the world.

As time goes on, as men get wider or grander or more complex ideas of life, as the intellectual horizon broadens, the idea that Christ was perfect may be modified.

The New Testament seems to describe several individuals under the same name, or at least one individual who passed

through several stages or phases of religious development. Christ is described as a devout Jew, as one who endeavored to comply in all respects with the old law. Many sayings are attributed to him consistent with this idea. He certainly was a Hebrew in belief and feeling when he said "Swear not by Heaven, because it is God's throne, nor by earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is His holy city." These reasons were in exact accordance with the mythology of the Jews. God was regarded simply as an enormous man, as one who walked in the garden in the cool of the evening, as one who had met man face to face, who had conversed with Moses for forty days upon Mount Sinai, as a great king, with a throne in the heavens, using the earth to rest his feet upon, and regarding Jerusalem as His holy city.

Then we find plenty of evidence that he wished to reform the religion of the Jews; to fulfil the law, not to abrogate it. Then there is still another change: he has ceased his efforts to reform that religion and has become a destroyer. He holds the Temple in contempt and repudiates the idea that Jerusalem is the holy city. He concludes that it is unnecessary to go to some mountain or some building to worship or to find God, and insists that the heart is the true Temple, that ceremonies are useless, that all pomp and pride and show are needless, and that it is enough to worship God under heaven's dome, in spirit and in truth.

It is impossible to harmonize these views unless we admit that Christ was the subject of growth and change; that in consequence of growth and change he modified his views; that, from wanting to preserve Judaism as it was, he became convinced that it ought to be reformed. That he then abandoned the idea of reformation, and made up his mind that the only reformation of which the Jewish religion was capable was destruction. If he was in fact a man, then the course he pursued was natural; but if he was God, it is perfectly absurd. If we give to him perfect knowledge, then it is impossible to account for change or growth. If, on the other hand, the ground is taken that he was a perfect man, then, it might be asked, Was he perfect when he wished to preserve, or when he wished to reform, or when he resolved to destroy, the religion of the Jews? If he is to be regarded as perfect, although not divine, when did he reach perfection?

It is perfectly evident that Christ, or the character that bears

that name, imagined that the world was about to be destroyed, or at least purified by fire, and that, on account of this curious belief, he became the enemy of marriage, of all earthly ambition and of all enterprise. With that view in his mind, he said to himself, "Why should we waste our energies in producing food for destruction? Why should we endeavor to beautify a world that is so soon to perish?" Filled with the thought of coming change, he insisted that there was but one important thing, and that was for each man to save his soul. He should care nothing for the ties of kindred, nothing for wife or child or property, in the shadow of the coming disaster. He should take care of himself. He endeavored, as it is said, to induce men to desert all they had, to let the dead bury the dead, and follow him. He told his disciples, or those he wished to make his disciples, according to the Testament, that it was their duty to desert wife and child and property, and if they would so desert kindred and wealth, he would reward them here and hereafter.

We know now—if we know anything—that Jesus was mistaken about the coming of the end, and we know now that he was greatly controlled in his ideas of life, by that mistake. Believing that the end was near, he said, "Take no thought for the morrow, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink or wherewithal ye shall be clothed." It was in view of the destruction of the world that he called the attention of his disciples to the lily that toiled not and yet excelled Solomon in the glory of its raiment. Having made this mistake, having acted upon it, certainly we cannot now say that he was perfect in knowledge.

He is regarded by many millions as the impersonation of patience, of forbearance, of meekness and mercy, and yet, according to the account, he said many extremely bitter words, and threatened eternal pain.

We also know, if the account be true, that he claimed to have supernatural power, to work miracles, to cure the blind and to raise the dead, and we know that he did nothing of the kind. So if the writers of the New Testament tell the truth as to what Christ claimed, it is absurd to say that he was a perfect man. If honest, he was deceived, and those who are deceived are not perfect.

There is nothing in the New Testament, so far as we know, that touches on the duties of nation to nation, or of nation to its citizens; nothing of human liberty; not one word about educa-

tion; not the faintest hint that there is such a thing as science; nothing calculated to stimulate industry, commerce, or invention; not one word in favor of art, of music or anything calculated to feed or clothe the body, nothing to develop the brain of man.

When it is assumed that the life of Christ, as described in the New Testament, is perfect, we at least take upon ourselves the burden of deciding what perfection is. People who asserted that Christ was divine, that he was actually God, reached the conclusion, without any laborious course of reasoning, that all he said and did was absolute perfection. They said this because they had first been convinced that he was divine. The moment his divinity is given up and the assertion is made that he was perfect, we are not permitted to reason in that way. They said he was God, therefore perfect. Now, if it is admitted that he was human, the conclusion that he was perfect does not follow. We then take the burden upon ourselves of deciding what perfection is. To decide what is perfect is beyond the powers of the human mind.

Renan, in spite of his education, regarded Christ as a man, and did the best he could to account for the miracles that had been attributed to him, for the legends that had gathered about his name, and the impossibilities connected with his career, and also tried to account for the origin or birth of these miracles, of these legends, of these myths, including the resurrection and ascension. I am not satisfied with all the conclusions he reached or with all the paths he travelled. The refraction of light caused by passing through a woman's tears is hardly a sufficient foundation for a belief in so miraculous a miracle as the bodily ascension of Jesus Christ.

There is another thing attributed to Christ that seems to me conclusive evidence against the claim of perfection. Christ is reported to have said that all sins could be forgiven except the sin against the Holy Ghost. This sin, however, is not defined. Although Christ died for the whole world, that through him all might be saved, there is this one terrible exception: There is no salvation for those who have sinned, or who may hereafter sin, against the Holy Ghost. Thousands of persons are now in asylums, having lost their reason because of their fear that they had committed this unknown, this undefined, this unpardonable sin.

It is said that a Roman Emperor went through a form of publishing his laws or proclamations, posting them so high on pillars

that they could not be read, and then took the lives of those who ignorantly violated these unknown laws. He was regarded as a tyrant, as a murderer. And yet, what shall we say of one who declared that the sin against the Holy Ghost was the only one that could not be forgiven, and then left an ignorant world to guess what that sin is? Undoubtedly this horror is an interpolation.

There is something like it in the Old Testament. It is asserted by Christians that the Ten Commandments are the foundation of all law and of all civilization, and you will find lawyers insisting that the Mosaic Code was the first information that man received on the subject of law; that before that time the world was without any knowledge of justice or mercy. If this be true the Jews had no divine laws, no real instruction on any legal subject until the Ten Commandments were given. Consequently, before that time there had been proclaimed or published no law against the worship of other gods or of idols. Moses had been on Mount Sinai talking with Jehovah. At the end of the dialogue he received the Tables of Stone and started down the mountain for the purpose of imparting this information to his followers. When he reached the camp he heard music. He saw people dancing, and he found that in his absence Aaron and the rest of the people had cast a molten calf which they were then worshipping. This so enraged Moses that he broke the Tables of Stone and made preparations for the punishment of the Jews. Remember that they knew nothing about this law, and, according to the modern Christian claims, could not have known that it was wrong to melt gold and silver and mould it in the form of a calf. And yet Moses killed about thirty thousand of these people for having violated a law of which they had never heard; a law known only to one man and one God. Nothing could be more unjust, more ferocious, than this; and yet it can hardly be said to exceed in cruelty the announcement that a certain sin was unpardonable and then fail to define the sin. Possibly, to inquire what the sin is, is the sin.

Renan regards Jesus as a man, and his work gets its value from the fact that it is written from a human standpoint. At the same time he, consciously or unconsciously, or may be for the purpose of sprinkling a little holy water on the heat of religious indignation, now and then seems to speak of him as more than human, or as having accomplished something that man could not.

He asserts that "the Gospels are in part legendary; that they contain many things not true; that they are full of miracles and of the supernatural." At the same time he insists that these legends, these miracles, these supernatural things do not affect the truth of the probable things contained in these writings. He sees, and sees clearly, that there is no evidence that Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John wrote the books attributed to them; that, as a matter of fact, the mere title of "according to Matthew," "according to Mark," shows that they were written by others who claimed them to be in accordance with the stories that had been told by Matthew or by Mark. So Renan takes the ground that the Gospel of Luke is founded on anterior documents and "is the work of a man who selected, pruned and combined, and that the same man wrote the Acts of the Apostles and in the same way."

The Gospels were certainly written long after the events described, and Renan finds the reason for this in the fact that the Christians believed that the world was about to end; that, consequently, there was no need of composing books; it was only necessary for them to preserve in their hearts during the little margin of time that remained a lively image of Him whom they soon expected to meet in the clouds. For this reason the Gospels themselves had but little authority for 150 years, the Christians relying on oral traditions. Renan shows that there was not the slightest scruple about inserting additions in the Gospels, variously combining them, and in completing some by taking parts from others; that the books passed from hand to hand, and that each one transcribed in the margin of his copy the words and parables he had found elsewhere which touched him; that it was not until human tradition became weakened that the text bearing the names of the Apostles became authoritative.

Renan has criticised the Gospels somewhat in the same spirit that he would criticise a modern work. He saw clearly that the metaphysics filling the discourses of John were deformities and distortions, full of mysticism, having nothing to do really with the character of Jesus. He shows too "that the simple idea of the Kingdom of God, at the time the Gospel according to St. John was written, had faded away; that the hope of the advent of Christ was growing dim, and that from belief the Disciples passed into discussion, from discussion to dogma, from dogma to ceremony," and, finding that the new Heaven and the new Earth were

not coming as expected, they turned their attention to governing the old Heaven and the old Earth. The Disciples were willing to be humble for a few days, with the expectation of wearing crowns forever. They were satisfied with poverty, believing that the wealth of the world was to be theirs. The coming of Christ, however, being for some unaccountable reason delayed, poverty and humility grew irksome, and human nature began to assert itself.

In the Gospel of John you will find the metaphysics of the Church. There you find the Second Birth. There you find the doctrine of the Atonement clearly set forth. There you find that God died for the whole world, and that whosoever believeth not in Him is to be damned. There is nothing of the kind in Matthew. Matthew makes Christ say that, if you will forgive others, God will forgive you. The Gospel "according to Mark" is the same. So is the Gospel "according to Luke." There is nothing about salvation through belief, nothing about the Atonement. In Mark, in the last chapter, the Apostles are told to go into all the world and preach the Gospel, with the statement that whoever believed and was baptised should be saved, and whoever failed to believe should be damned. But we now know that that is an interpolation. Consequently, Matthew, Mark, and Luke never had the faintest conception of the "Christian religion." They knew nothing of the Atonement, nothing of salvation by faith—nothing. So that, if a man had read only Matthew, Mark and Luke, and had strictly followed what he found, he would have found himself, after death, in perdition.

Renan finds that certain portions of the Gospel "according to John" were added later; that the entire twenty-first chapter is an interpolation; also that many places bear the traces of erasures and corrections. So he says that it would be "impossible for any one to compose a life of Jesus, with any meaning in it, from the discourses which John attributes to him, and he holds that this Gospel of John is full of preaching, Christ demonstrating himself; full of argumentation, full of stage effect, devoid of simplicity, with long arguments after each miracle, stiff and awkward discourses, the tone of which is often false and unequal." He also insists that there are evidently "artificial portions, variations like that of a musician improvising on a given theme."

In spite of all this, Renan, willing to soothe the prejudice of

his time, takes the ground that the four canonical gospels are authentic, that they date from the first century, that the authors were, generally speaking, those to whom they are attributed; but he insists that their historic value is very diverse. This is a back-handed stroke. Admitting, first, that they are authentic; second, that they were written about the end of the first century; third, that they are not of equal value, disposes, so far as he is concerned, of the dogma of inspiration.

One is at a loss to undertand why four Gospels should have been written. As a matter of fact there can be only one true account of any occurrence, or of any number of occurrences. Now, it must be taken for granted, that an inspired account is true. Why then should there be four inspired accounts? It may be answered that all were not to write the entire story. To this the reply is that all attempted to cover substantially the same ground.

Many years ago the early fathers thought it necessary to say why there were four inspired books, and some of them said, because there were four cardinal directions and the Gospels fitted the north, south, east and west. Others said that there were four principal winds—a gospel for each wind. They might have added that some animals have four legs.

Renan admits that the narrative portions have not the same authority; "that many legends proceeded from the zeal of the second Christian generation; that the narrative of Luke is historically weak; that sentences attributed to Jesus have been distorted and exaggerated; that the book was written outside of Palestine and after the siege of Jerusalem; that Luke endeavors to make the different narratives agree, changing them for that purpose; that he softens the passages which had become embarrassing; that he exaggerated the marvellous, omitted errors in chronology; that he was a compiler, a man who had not been an eye-witness himself, and who had not seen eye-witnesses, but who labors at texts and wrests their sense to make them agree." This certainly is very far from inspiration. So "Luke interprets the documents according to his own idea; being a kind of anarchist, opposed to property, and persuaded that the triumph of the poor was approaching; that he was especially fond of the anecdotes showing the conversion of sinners, the exaltation of the humble, and that he modified ancient traditions to give them this meaning."

Renan reached the conclusion that the Gospels are neither biographies after the manner of Suetonius nor fictitious legends in the style of Philostratus, but that they are legendary biographies like the legends of the saints, the lives of Plotinus and Isidore, in which historical truth and the desire to present models of virtue are combined in various degrees; that they are "inexact;" that they "contain numerous errors and discordances." So he takes the ground that twenty or thirty years after Christ His reputation had greatly increased, that "legends had begun to gather about Him like clouds," that "death added to His perfection, freeing Him from all defects in the eyes of those who had loved Him, that His followers wrested the prophecies so that they might fit Him. They said, 'He is the Messiah.' The Messiah was to do certain things; therefore Jesus did certain things. Then an account would be given of the doing." All of which of course shows that there can be maintained no theory of inspiration.

It is admitted that where individuals are witnesses of the same transaction, and where they agree upon the vital points and disagree upon details, the disagreement may be consistent with their honesty, as tending to show that they have not agreed upon a story; but if the witnesses are inspired of God then there is no reason for their disagreeing on anything, and if they do disagree it is a demonstration that they were not inspired, but it is not a demonstration that they are not honest. While perfect agreement may be evidence of rehearsal, a failure to perfectly agree is not a demonstration of the truth or falsity of a story; but if the witnesses claim to be inspired, the slightest disagreement is a demonstration that they were not inspired.

Renan reaches the conclusion, proving every step that he takes, that the four principal documents—that is to say, the four Gospels—are in "flagrant contradiction one with another." He attacks, and with perfect success, the miracles of the Scriptures, and upon this subject says: "Observation, which has never once been falsified, teaches us that miracles never happen, but in times and countries in which they are believed and before persons disposed to believe them. No miracle ever occurred in the presence of men capable of testing its miraculous character." He further takes the ground that no contemporary miracle will bear inquiry, and that consequently it is probable that the miracles of antiquity

which have been performed in popular gatherings would be shown to be simple illusion, were it possible to criticise them in detail. In the name of universal experience he banishes miracles from history. These were brave things to do, things that will bear good fruit. As long as men believe in miracles, past or present, they remain the prey of superstition. The Catholic is taught that miracles were performed anciently not only, but that they are still being performed. This is consistent inconsistency. Protestants teach a double doctrine: That miracles used to be performed, that the laws of nature used to be violated, but that no miracle is performed now. No Protestant will admit that any miracle was performed by the Catholic Church. Otherwise, Protestants could not be justified in leaving a church with whom the God of miracles dwelt. So every Protestant has to adopt two kinds of reasoning: that the laws of Nature used to be violated and that miracles used to be performed, but that since the apostolic age Nature has had her way and the Lord has allowed facts to exist and to hold the field. A supernatural account, according to Renan, "always implies credulity or imposture"—probably both.

It does not seem possible to me that Christ claimed for himself what the Testament claims for him. These claims were made by admirers, by followers, by missionaries.

When the early Christians went to Rome they found plenty of demigods. It was hard to set aside the religion of a demigod by telling the story of a man from Nazareth. These missionaries, not to be outdone in ancestry, insisted—and this was after the Gospel "according to St. John" had been written—that Christ was the Son of God. Matthew believed that he was the son of David, and the Messiah, and gave the genealogy of Joseph, his father, to support that claim.

In the time of Christ no one imagined that he was of divine origin. This was an after-growth. In order to place themselves on an equality with Pagans they started the claim of divinity, and also took the second step requisite in that country: First, a god for his father, and second, a virgin for his mother. This was the Pagan combination of greatness, and the Christians added to this that Christ was God.

It is hard to agree with the conclusion reached by Renan, that Christ formed and intended to form a church. Such evidence, it seems to me, is hard to find in the Testament. Christ seemed to

satisfy himself, according to the Testament, with a few statements, some of them exceedingly wise and tender, some utterly impracticable and some intolerant.

If we accept the conclusions reached by Renan we will throw away, the legends without foundation; the miraculous legends; and everything inconsistent with what we know of Nature. Very little will be left—a few sayings to be found among those attributed to Confucius, to Buddha, to Krishna, to Epictetus, to Zeno, and to many others. Some of these sayings are full of wisdom, full of kindness, and others rush to such extremes that they touch the borders of insanity. When struck on one cheek to turn the other, is really joining a conspiracy to secure the triumph of brutality. To agree not to resist evil is to become an accomplice of all injustice. We must not take from industry, from patriotism, from virtue the right of self-defence.

Undoubtedly Renan gave an honest transcript of his mind, the road his thought had followed, the reasons in their order that had occurred to him, the criticisms born of thought, and the qualifications, softening phrases, children of old sentiments and of emotions that had not entirely passed away. He started, one might say, from the altar and, during a considerable part of the journey, carried the incense with him. The farther he got away, the greater was his clearness of vision and the more thoroughly he was convinced that Christ was merely a man, an idealist. But, remembering the altar, he excused exaggeration in the "inspired" books, not because it was from heaven, not because it was in harmony with our ideas of veracity, but because the writers of the Gospel were imbued with the Oriental spirit of exaggeration, a spirit perfectly understood by the people who first read the Gospels, because the readers knew the habits of the writers.

It had been contended for many years that no one could pass judgment on the veracity of the Scriptures who did not understand Hebrew. This position was perfectly absurd. No man needs to be a student of Hebrew to know that the shadow on the dial did not go back several degrees to convince a petty king that a boil was not to be fatal. Renan, however, filled the requirement. He was an excellent Hebrew scholar. This was a fortunate circumstance, because it answered a very old objection.

The founder of Christianity was, for his own sake, taken from the divine pedestal and allowed to stand like other men on the

earth, to be judged by what he said and did, by his theories, by his philosophy, by his spirit.

No matter whether Renan came to a correct conclusion or not, his work did a vast deal of good. He convinced many that implicit reliance could not be placed upon the Gospels, that the Gospels themselves are of unequal worth; that they were deformed by ignorance and falsehood, or, at least, by mistake; that if they wished to save the reputation of Christ they must not rely wholly on the Gospels, or on what is found in the New Testament, but they must go farther and examine all legends touching him. Not only so, but they must throw away the miraculous, the impossible and the absurd.

He also has shown that the early followers of Christ endeavored to add to the reputation of their Master by attributing to him the miraculous and the foolish; that while these stories added to his reputation at that time, since the world has advanced they must be cast aside or the reputation of the Master must suffer.

It will not do now to say that Christ himself pretended to do miracles. This would establish the fact at least that he was mistaken. But we are compelled to say that his disciples insisted that he was a worker of miracles. This shows, either that they were mistaken or untruthful.

We all know that a sleight-of-hand performer could gain a greater reputation among savages than Darwin or Humboldt; and we know that the world in the time of Christ was filled with barbarians, with people who demanded the miraculous, who expected it; with people, in fact, who had a stronger belief in the supernatural than in the natural; people who never thought it worth while to record facts. The hero of such people, the Christ of such people, with his miracles, cannot be the Christ of the thoughtful and scientific.

Renan was a man of most excellent temper; candid; not striving for victory, but for truth; conquering, as far as he could, the old superstitions; not entirely free, it may be, but believing himself to be so. He did great good. He has helped to destroy the fictions of faith. He has helped to rescue man from the prison of superstition, and this is the greatest benefit that man can bestow on man.

He did another great service, not only to Jews, but to Chris-

tendom, by writing the history of "The People of Israel." Christians for many centuries have persecuted the Jews. They have charged them with the greatest conceivable crime—with having crucified an infinite God. This absurdity has hardened the hearts of men and poisoned the minds of children. The persecution of the Jews is the meanest, the most senseless and cruel page in history. Every civilized Christian should feel on his cheeks the red spots of shame as he reads the wretched and infamous story. The flame of this prejudice is fanned and fed in the Sunday-schools of our day, and the orthodox minister points proudly to the atrocities perpetrated against the Jews by the barbarians of Russia as evidences of the truth of the inspired Scriptures. In every wound God puts a tongue to proclaim the truth of his book.

If the charge that the Jews killed God were true, it is hardly reasonable to hold those who are now living responsible for what their ancestors did nearly nineteen centuries ago.

But there is another point in connection with this matter: If Christ was God, then the Jews could not have killed him without his consent; and, according to the orthodox creed, if he had not been sacrificed, the whole world would have suffered eternal pain. Nothing can exceed the meanness of the prejudice of Christians against the Jewish people. They should not be held responsible for their savage ancestors, or for their belief that Jehovah was an intelligent and merciful God, superior to all other gods. Even Christians do not wish to be held responsible for the Inquisition, for the Torquemadas and the John Calvins, for the witch-burners and the Quaker-whippers, for the slave-traders and child-stealers, the most of whom were believers in our "glorious gospel," and many of whom had been born the second time.

Renan did much to civilize the Christians by telling the truth in a charming and convincing way about the "People of Israel." Both sides are greatly indebted to him: one he has ably defended, and the other greatly enlightened.

Having done what good he could in giving what he believed was light to his fellow men, he had no fear of becoming a victim of God's wrath, and so he laughingly said: "For my part I imagine that if the Eternal in his severity were to send me to hell I should succeed in escaping from it. I would send up to my Creator a supplication that would make him smile. The course of reasoning by which I would prove to him that it was through

his fault that I was damned would be so subtle that he would find some difficulty in replying. The fate which would suit me best is Purgatory—a charming place, where many delightful romances begun on earth must be continued."

Such cheerfulness, such good philosophy, with cap and bells, such banter and blasphemy, such sound and solid sense drive to madness the priest who thinks the curse of Rome can fright the world. How the snake of superstition writhes when he finds that his fangs have lost their poison.

He was one of the gentlest of men—one of the fairest in discussion, dissenting from the views of others with modesty, presenting his own with clearness and candor. His mental manners were excellent. He was not positive as to the "unknowable." He said "Perhaps." He knew that knowledge is good if it increases the happiness of man; and he felt that superstition is the assassin of liberty and civilization. He lived a life of cheerfulness, of industry, devoted to the welfare of mankind. He was a seeker of happiness by the highway of the natural, a destroyer of the dogmas of mental deformity, a worshipper of Liberty and the Ideal. As he lived, he died—hopeful and serene—and now, standing in imagination by his grave, we ask: Will the night be eternal? The brain says, Perhaps; while the heart hopes for the Dawn.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

EUROPE AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

GERMANY, BY W. H. EDWARDS, CONSUL-GENERAL AT BERLIN;
RUSSIA, BY J. M. CRAWFORD, CONSUL-GENERAL
AT ST. PETERSBURG.

I.—GERMANY.

THE Fatherland will be well represented at the Chicago Exposition.

For nearly a year past has the indefatigable Imperial Commissioner, Privy Council Wermuth, devoted all his time, as well as that of numerous assistants, to this work, and his efforts are gradually shaping and finishing the work into the grandest and most thorough display that German industries and arts ever made at any foreign exhibition.

The German Government early recognized the importance of the occasion. The great commercial relations of the two countries, as well as the ties of blood and friendship, which have ever drawn them together, forbid anything but the most hearty participation in the American enterprise.

Herr Wermuth, who had already proved his capacity for such work at the Australian World's Fair, was chosen to take charge of the matter. He went to Chicago last fall, consulted with the authorities of the Fair, and then returned to Germany to commence work in earnest. The German Government proposed, and the Reichstag granted, a subsidy of one million marks, which was soon followed by an additional grant of two million marks, thus making a total amount of three million marks ($750,000) available.

There were, at first, some slight objections on the part of certain industries and in various localities against the Fair, but these were overcome by the persistent efforts of the Commissioner, assisted by the Government. The Kaiser himself, who, indeed, had always shown a marked liking for America, took every oppor-

tunity to promote the enterprise, so that to-day every department of German life and industry is engaged in preparations for the Chicago Exhibition. Some 250,000 square feet of floor space will in all departments be taken up by German exhibits. The Industrial Building will be occupied to the extent of 100,000 square feet, and in the Machinery Hall, 30,000 or 40,000 ; in the Art Building, 20,000; and in the Electric Building, 20,000 square feet, will be needed. Similar spaces are required in the Agricultural and Horticultural Halls and the Department of Mining.

The Railway and Transportation Department will also be thoroughly represented. One of the chief, if not the main, exhibition of German skill and industry will be made in the textile branch. The celebrated hosiery and glove manufactures of Chemnitz, its "fast black" dyes, and its great carpet manufactures will be thoroughly represented. Crefeld will contribute silks, satins, and velvets ; Plauen and Greiz, cloths, dress materials, and diagonal goods ; Zittau will show its laces, and Annaberg its embroideries. Linen goods from Bielefeld and from Silesia, the celebrated cloth factories on both sides of the Rhine, and the manufactures of Alsace will all add to the display.

Musical instruments will come from all over Germany—Plauen, Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden ; in fact, all the centres of the musical trade will send their products. The exhibition of chemicals and dyes will be very profuse. Drugs to cure the sick, dyes for industrial purposes, chemicals of every description and in the great variety required by modern life, will be shown.

The iron and steel industry of the great Westphalia and Rhenish manufacturing centres are making efforts for proper representation. Machines of every sort, those adapted to the peaceful pursuits of mankind, as well as the monster engines of war, will be exhibited. Another great display will be that of industrial art, which has obtained great proportions in Germany. The famous porcelain of Berlin and Dresden, the industrial art products of Munich, Carlsruhe, and Hanover will be sent to Chicago in large quantities and wonderful variety.

Art itself, painting and sculpture will be worthily represented. The art academies and artists' societies of Berlin, Munich, Dusseldorf, Weimar and Dresden are preparing exhibits.

The purposes of science will be served by a large display of optical and scientific instruments and wares. While the more

serious work of life will show itself in these numerous departments, childhood will be made happy by a display of toys from the Erzgebirge, from Sonneberg and historical Nuremberg. The cheapest, as well as the most costly and intricate toys which Germany produces, will be found in this department.

The German Government has issued orders to the mining officers to send in all the fine specimens of minerals obtainable. It expects to have a great mineralogical collection on view.

Agriculture will be represented by agricultural machinery, specimens of grains, grasses, seeds, fruits, and wines. The preserved fruits of Germany, so justly celebrated, the beet-sugar of Magdeburg and other agricultural products of Germany will be exhibited. It is also proposed to send over specimens of the fine horses and cattle of the German marshes and of Holstein. The sight-seer, wearied of the day work, can turn for rest, and possibly, refreshment, to the department where the grand wines of the Rhine and Main and the golden fluid of the Moselle, as well as the famous brews of Munich and the foaming weissbeer of Berlin, are exhibited.

In the electrical department the scientific discoveries of Helmholtz and Siemens, made subservient to the uses of industrial and every day life, will be exhibited.

One of the most interesting features of the German display will be the Department of Woman's Work. Her Royal Highness Princess Frederick Charles has consented to act as lady patroness of this department. Ladies of the highest social standing, such as Countess Pückler; Frau von Schelling, wife of the Minister of Justice; Frau Delbrück, the wife of ex-Minister Delbrück, are giving their names and assistance to the work. The business organization is in the hands of Frau Schepeler-Lette, President of the famous "Lette Verein," which has done so much for the advancement of women in Germany. She will be assisted by Fräulein von Keüdell, of the "Verein Berliner Künstlerinnen;" Frau Director Schrader, of the "Pestalozzi–Fröbel Verein;" Fräulein Louise Fuhrmann; Fräulein von Cotta, of the Victoria Lyceum;" Fräulein Helene Lange; Frau Louisa Morgenstern, and by many other shining lights of German womanhood. The department will be divided into four subdivisions, which will show the work of women in art, education, domestic work, social and Verein work, in the work of charity and of children's care and

education. It will also show the workings of the Kindergarten system and of the Fresh Air Fund, as they are carried on in Germany. Altogether the "Women's Department" will be a grand display of womanly work and practical humanity.

The German government will construct a separate building at the fair grounds to represent Germany and to serve as a central point for the German interests. Commissioner Wermuth will have his office in this building. A feature of the German exhibition will be the "German Village of the Middle Ages," which will be built on the "Midway Plaisance" under the auspices of the Deutsche Bank of Berlin. It will show the architecture and home life of the German peasants of that period and also the household industries and German village life of the present day.

I have merely drawn the outlines of the German exhibits. It would far exceed the scope of this article to enter into a detailed description of each separate department or to describe any individual exhibit. While much remains to be done, yet the work is crystallizing into perfect shape, and there is no doubt that Germany will have reason to be proud of her exhibits.

W. H. EDWARDS,
Consul-General.

II.—RUSSIA.

IT MAY interest the people of the United States to know that Russia will make a magnificent display of their industries at Chicago in 1893. Everything has been done that can be done by the Central government at St. Petersburg to induce manufacturers and producers to take part in the great American enterprise. Thanks to the timely visit of the World's Fair Commissioners to St. Petersburg in the summer of 1891, His Excellency the Minister of Finance was induced to look upon the Columbian Exposition with marked favor. Largely due to his report, His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor, gave an order that all expenses whatsoever necessary to make a full and favorable exhibit of Russian goods at Chicago should be paid out of the Imperial Treasury. These expenses may be summarized as follows:

1. Transportation from St. Petersburg to Chicago and return of all goods regarded worthy of exhibition.

2. Insurance of all such wares against loss or damage on sea or on land.

3. Expenses of installation and decorations of the goods of the Russian section, including suitable show-cases and furniture.

4. As all goods designed for the Exposition must be collected at St. Petersburg, it has been ordered that all steamboat and railway companies in the Empire shall reduce their tariff 50 per cent. on all such exhibits, from all inland points of European or Asiatic Russia to St. Petersburg.

It will thus be seen that Russian exhibitors will have practically no expense in order to expose their products at Chicago.

In order to guarantee the success of the Russian section of the World's Fair, His Imperial Majesty, in a ukase, has appointed a special commission to take entire charge of the work of promoting a first-class exhibit. The members of this commission may be named in the following order :

President : Privy Councellor of State, M. Alexis Baer.

Vice-President : Basile Timiriasoff, Councillor of State, and Vice-Director of the Imperial Board of Trade and Manufacturing.

Active members : Councillor of State Nicolai Zabouguin, and Vice Director of the Department of Customs ; Councillor of State Valerian Tchernaieff, of the Ministry of Domains ; Councillor of State A. Pletnieff, of the Cabinet of His Imperial Majesty ; Councillor of State Nicolai Labsine, Professor of the Imperial Technological Institute ; Councillor of State Alexander Dabronitsky ; Councillor of State and Secretary of the General Commission Alexis Kobeliatsky ; Privy Councillor Leonide Verchoutseff, of the Ministry of War ; Central Admiral Stephane Makaroff, of the Ministry of Marine ; Councillor of State Charles de St. Mère, of the Ministry of Public Instruction ; and the Secretary of the Imperial Academy, Count Jean Tolstoi, together with Demetrius Yourieff, as representatives of the Academy of Fine Arts.

All of the leading manufacturers of the Russian Empire, European and Asiatic, as well as the Committees of Exchange in the several cities of Russia, all the Boards of Trade and Manufacture, the Governors of all the provinces, have been officially requested to make propaganda in their respective districts urging an active participation in the Columbian Exposition. The Governors-General of very distant districts, as for example, the Caucasus, Siberia, Turkestan, Finland, etc., have received due orders from the government to use every effort to aid the Imperial

Commission at St. Petersburg in this great enterprise. Special invitations have been sent to the Archæological, Historical and the other scientific institutions to take part. In fact, every department of Russian interest and industry will be fully represented.

One may be able to judge something of the magnitude of the Russian exhibit from the following summary of the different branches of the Imperial Government that will be represented :

1. The exhibit under the Department of Public Domains, under which belong coal and iron exhibits, petroleum districts, agriculture, forestry, fishing and the like.
2. Exhibits of the War Department.
3. Exhibits of the Navy Department.
4. Exhibits of Public Instruction.
5. Exhibits of the Department of Appanage.
6. Exhibits of Ways and Communications.

Conforming to the request of the directors of the World's Fair the model of the first ship of the Russian fleet, built by Peter the Great, will be an attractive feature of the Russian section. The Ministry of Navy has decided, under special application, to send a large number of models of the Russian fleet to Chicago. Sketches and models of ships specially constructed for the transport of petroleum will also be on exhibition.

The Ministry of War is preparing a fine collection of various military objects, made in the factories and workshops of Russia, and a complete set of the military works edited by the War Scientific Department will be sent to Chicago.

The Ministry of Public Domains will exhibit a complete collection of the agricultural products of Russia, including all sorts of fruit, vegetables, cereals, wood, and the products of the stone and metal mills, as well as the fisheries belonging to the Government. It is intended to make the agricultural branch of the Russian section as complete as possible, that planters and dealers in agricultural products and implements may have an opportunity to judge from personal observation of the state of Russian farming, especially as to such articles as are exported by both countries.

The Ministry of Public Instruction is taking great pains to furnish to the visitors of the World's Fair a correct idea of the present state of public schools in Russia, covering elementary school work, as well as that of the academies, colleges, technical and professional schools, gymnasiums and universities.

The Department of Appanage will exhibit wines in great variety, in bottles and in casks, from the immense vineyards of the Emperor, and situated in the Caucasus, Crimea and Bessarabia.

A Special Commission has been appointed under the supervision of the Ministry of Finance to make a complete exhibit of the industrial products of the factories of all grades in the Empire, especially of such as come within the realm of the Ministry of Public and Private Domains.

As regards exhibits of private merchants and manufacturers, I am able to state, from personal observation, that a very general participation may be confidently expected, covering almost every form of Russian wares, such as enamelled silver, so justly celebrated throughout the world for its artistic designs and beautiful workmanship; Russian bronzes, papier-maché, vases of Siberian stones in every variety, hand-wrought rugs and carpets, portieres, and hangings; silken, linen, cotton, woollen and silver fabrics; Orenburg shawls of such fineness that a shawl of fifteen feet square may be easily drawn through a finger-ring, leathern embroideries in silk, and silver, and gold in Oriental splendor; fur articles, among which will be found some of the finest examples of Russian sable and Kamtchatka beaver and silver fox; glass, and porcelain, and terra-cotta wares from the Caucasus; samovars and copper goods, iron bronzes in beautiful and artistic designs for house decoration; Turkish, Caucasian, and Arabic house ornaments; costumes of the different provinces, royal and peasant costumes of the several reigns, together with imperial decorations and fashions under the different emperors, some of which reach back to the time of the czars; church robes and decorations.

Textile, gold, silver, copper and bronze manufactures, sugar, distilleries, petroleum, agricultural products, and all other great industries of Russia, will be represented both by the government, and by private producers. The owners of coal mines in the government of Ekaterinoslav will exhibit a number of pyramids to show the increase of the coal industry in the Donez-district during the last twenty years. These pyramids will show the one-millionth part of the actual output from the years 1850, 1870 and 1890. The first pyramid will weigh a half pood (18 lbs.), and will represent an output of 500,000 poods in 1850; the second will weigh 15½ poods, and represent in 1870, an output of 15,500,000 poods; and the third will weigh 150 poods, representing in 1890, an output of coal of

150,000,000 poods. In order to give some idea of the amount of coal thus represented, models of the largest Eyptian pyramids will be exhibited in the same proportion, and the latter will seem, in comparison to the coal-pyramids of Russia, like mere toys.

Largely the result of an earnest appeal made in a beautifully worded and model letter written by Mrs. Potter Palmer to Her Imperial Majesty, the Empress, a Board of Lady Commissioners has been appointed of which Mrs. Vitznigratsky, wife of the late Minister of Finance, is the president. Madame Narishkine, one of the first ladies of influence in the empire, is a very active member of this Commission, and she has assured me that a very complete exhibit of woman's work will be made. A set of dolls dressed to represent the fashions of the several Imperial Courts of Russia from the time of the czars to the present day, and also a set of dolls dressed to represent the national costumes of the peasantry of European and Asiatic Russia, will be an interesting feature of the Woman's Department. This department will contain all forms of drawn-linen work, laces in linen and silk, embroideries in gold, silver and silk, books, music, paintings, prison-work, school-work, patented inventions and peasant-work ; in short, everything that woman has done in Russia will be exhibited.

The exhibition of art in all its branches will be very fine, under the supervision of Count Jean Tolstoi. The great marine artist, Aivanousky, will exhibit several paintings relative to the discovery of America by Columbus. I have seen many of the pictures to be sent by the Russian School of Art to Chicago, and the collection will be excellent. Such artists as Verestchagin, Makovsky, Reiper, Schiskin, and Gruzinsky will also be duly represented, and will surprise many a connoisseur of art. Those who are able to recall the splendid exhibit of Russia at the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia will be somewhat prepared to find an exhibit at Chicago vastly more varied and magnificent than that.

The evident feeling of genuine friendship, shown by the Russian, of whatever class or creed, for America or Americans, and which has become intensified greatly by the humane contributions of the American people to the sufferers of Russia during the past year, has done much to further interest in this empire in the World's Columbian Exposition.

J. M. CRAWFORD.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

OBJECTIONS TO THEATRICAL LIFE.

In the face of convincing evidence of the significant financial importance of the theatre, and in spite of the homage to the beauties and the merits of dramatic art, popular sentiment exclaims against acting as a calling.

Why?

In the United States fifty thousand persons depend upon the stage for a livelihood. When it is also remembered that there are in the United States not more than six established stock companies, and that only about five hundred out of these fifty thousand persons can be given stationary—non-travelling—engagements, the problem of the private life of the remaining forty-nine thousand five hundred becomes an interesting one.

While it is widely recognized that the mode of existence of the strolling player is such as to test to the utmost both the strength and the weakness of human nature, intelligent acquaintance with the causes that make it so is limited.

The promiscuous companionships encouraged by the limited numbers of a travelling theatrical company, and the intense strain imposed by continuous travel, are issues of the enforced mutability of the life from which result many of its difficulties and failures.

Systematic habits of living—the desirable adjuncts of all correct conduct—become impossible. And herein lurks a serious and subtle danger, for men's morality is as often attributable to the regular routine which the occupation of their daily lives renders necessary as to inherent righteousness. A business which forces a man to breakfast at nine to-day, at eleven to-morrow, and makes his dinner his breakfast the day after, will soon render easy for him other irregularities in no way related to gastronomy.

The difficulty which the travelling actor experiences in establishing a place of residence, without doubt dwarfs his interest in many matters which are to men in other callings of vital importance. He seldom possesses a fixed value in any community, and in consequence occupies little of his time with either the duties or the privileges of citizenship. Deprived thus of much which adds substantial dignity to the lives of other men he substitutes whatever his opportunity, his inclination or his judgment directs. The nature of this substitution is the measure of his individual worth.

Apart from any social bias, his professional itinerancy ostracises him from the rest of the world nine months out of twelve. Interchange of thought upon those topics which are continually agitating mankind—art, science, religion, literature—becomes limited to the few minds about him.

It is true the best opinions of the best intellects are always at his command in the magazines and reviews; but personal encounter with those to whom these matters are living interests—keen discussion, that sharpener of men's wits and understandings, is denied him. His world, for three-fourths of the year, is made up of perhaps less than a score of people, in not one of whom, in all probability, has he any but the most casual concern.

It is to be regretted, too, that the stage is frequently recruited from those who claim their right to admission upon the basis of the enjoyment of the necessary artistic temperament, but who in reality merely covet that freedom of life which the exigencies of the profession appear to render natural. Pitiful profanation of a God-given talent! Its possession never yet lessened the obligations of mankind. Nature demands that the artist be, first of all, the man. She gives no son of hers a quit-claim of the duties of a faithful husband, an affectionate father, and a thrifty householder.

Schlegel gave dangerous encouragement to the unscrupulous when he wrote: "Whenever he (the actor) is filled with the tradesman-like anxiety of securing a maintenance for himself, his wife, his children, there is an end of all improvement." On the contrary, the actor who loves his calling, both as an art and as an occupation, looks to it not only to satisfy his personal intellectual needs, but to provide, as well, generous material support.

While a career upon the stage offers great inducements to men, it appears to possess an especial fascination for women. Diametrically opposed types of the sex are attracted to it. The shallow woman finds occasion for the display which vanity craves. To the inconstant woman it argues excuse for the indulgence of nomadic propensities, while the capable, sincere, determined woman sees in it, of all the avenues open to her for self-support and distinction, the one wherein she holds equal chances with her brother.

And it is little wonder, in a day when women's work and women's hire are questions of such importance, that the girl specially gifted, well-born and gently reared, high principled, morally and physically robust and boldly ambitious, should turn with a sort of grateful zeal to a calling which promises to reward her, artistically and financially, according to individual merit, regardless of her sex; for in acting neither sex nor force of precedent governs recognition from the public or regulates salaries.

It is this girl, at once the anxiety and the hope, the victim no less than the inspiration of the stage, whom public opinion has most in mind when it derogates a dramatic career. Self-conscious of the worthiness of the motives which actuate her, strong because of her inexperience, self-reliant because of her ignorance, and armed with undeniable ability, she is disposed to regard with an honest contempt any questions as to the wisdom of her determination to become an actress. Perhaps it is urged that society will regret her, that home and friends will miss her. She meets every objection with the unanswerable logic of self-conviction. Before all else, she argues, it pays. She can earn as much at it as a man!

But the demands which this coveted, high-paying, quickly-promoting profession will make of her are those which she is least prepared to meet.

The inherent artistic attributes which enable her to command an enviable salary presume invariably an acute sensibility. The quality in her art which most delights, which distinguishes her, is a superlative womanliness. Up to the period of her adoption of the stage these qualities have demanded and have won for her devotion, admiration and respect from men. Here all is changed; she is now the worker, the wage-earner, entered

in the lists with no favors for sex; and though she may flout the idea that she expects favors, the pivotal point on which her early troubles in her dramatic life turn is the fact that they are never volunteered. On the contrary, she is frequently expected to grant them. No one at all familiar with stage etiquette but knows that the struggle for preëminence between actor and actress is at times so violent that the latter, unless she be peculiarly fitted to stand out against masculine opposition, is induced to make concessions. In a word, men treat her as a business equal, with whom sharp competition is inevitable. Gentlemanly amenities, because of her sex, are always in danger of being misconstrued by her to mean professional surrender. It will then be readily seen that the woman best equipped for eminent distinction in the drama is she in whom extremes meet. Her art requires of her innate sentiment, grace, power, refinement of thought and broadness of intellect. Her material daily life on the boards demands an absolutely stolid insensibility to every form of exterior attack.

It may be pertinently suggested here that a calling which thus tends to give masculinity to the woman, perhaps effeminates the man. The question is a delicate one; the wise must answer it.

Touching the question of salaries, it is inexplicable to the thrifty in other business, how, in the face of the remuneration which meritorious acting receives, the average player is so frequently without material belongings. Various superficial causes may be advanced in explanation of it. No irremediable cause exists. Custom, which seeks to perpetuate the extravagant follies of many generations of dramatic life, is largely accountable for it. It is not to be denied that many luxuries, recognized as such and indulged in by only the solidly wealthy of other vocations, are commonly indispensable to very insignificant and moderately paid tyros of the stage. The suggestion may be more wholesome than welcome that prodigality is essentially vulgar.

The dramatic profession at large is unconventional. Let no sensitive dramatic novitiate wonder that the world decries her for having entered a calling in which are wantonly violated many of society's most rigid tenets. For society's tenets are the safeguards of human living. No man or woman can with safety ignore them. Those established rules of moral, civil and religious observance which have governed the world throughout the centuries, are very good old rules, and have accomplished their objects fairly well. Members of other crafts, devotees of other arts, follow them with wholesome results. Until the stage can offer a superior code it should not offend nice perception and good judgment by arrogating the right to disregard them.

JENNIE A. EUSTACE.

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE IN POLITICS.

ON THANKSGIVING DAY, November 29, 1888, Dr. Richard S. Storrs, of Brooklyn, preached a sermon on the then recent election of Mr. Harrison, in the course of which, according to the report in the New York *Tribune* of the following day, he said:

"I have nothng to say to-day of the immediate or prospective political effects of this election. But there are some things, and they are great things, connected with it, which seem to me to be occasions of rejoicing for all of us, and for which we may properly and heartily give thanks to God. One is, the high character of those who have been appointed to fill the highest offices in the nation. . . . Concerning Mr.

Morton, and concerning him who has been chosen to the higher office of the Presidency, we know that they are well-descended, well-educated, American citizens, and American Christians, ready to take and fulfil any Christian offices in the church or in society to which they are called. . . . It is a great thing for a nation to have men in whom character is so fine, and strong, and eminent, put into its highest offices. From the character of rulers comes an influence upon the character of the people. The aspiration of the young is moulded largely by it, especially when those rulers have been elected by the nation itself. It indicates its own moral tone. It indicates its own respect for Christian institutions and truths, when it elects such men to the highest offices in its gift."

The feeling which Dr. Storrs so aptly and accurately expressed in this sermon, was one which, no doubt, was largely shared by Christian people of Republican politics the country over. No close observer of the Presidential election of 1888 would hesitate to say that the religious prominence of Mr. Harrison was a significant factor in winning for him a plurality of votes in the doubtful States. It is only natural that professedly religious people should feel greater enthusiasm for, and confidence in, a candidate of strongly avowed religious professions. They, as did Dr. Storrs, see in such professions a guarantee of a higher tone in administration, and of a more conscientious discharge of official duties.

I wish here to guard myself against being misunderstood. I do not suppose, and, in my opinion, no one else of common sense supposes, that Mr. Harrison was consciously a party to any scheme by which any gossip of his religious principles was exploited for political effect. He was the same religious man in private as in public life. The gossip, which floated through the press, of how faithful he was at the "family altar," conducting morning prayers every morning through the year, and much more of the same character, was put in circulation as naturally and inevitably as the gossip of the way in which visiting delegations trampled down his lawn and carried off his fence piecemeal. But, although Mr. Harrison was in no way responsible for the circulation of this gossip, it nevertheless raised in an adroit and unanswerable way the issue of the religious character of the candidate. That issue, as it appealed to every one of religious sympathies, took the form of this question: Is it not better, as between two candidates, one of avowedly religious principle and the other not, to elect the former? Or, as Dr. Storrs put it, does not a nation indicate "its own respect for Christian institutions and truths, when it elects such men to the highest offices in its gift"?

The two candidates have been renominated, but it is significant that the religious issue of 1888 has not been again raised in this campaign of 1892. There are a number of reasons which insured this fortunate result, but they are too obvious to need repetition. As for the President, it may indeed be granted that Mr. Harrison has been governed in official, as well as in private life, by the dictates of a conscience trained to consider questions from the standpoint of religious obligation. If there has been no marked contrast in tone between his administration and that of preceding Presidents not so conspicuously identified with religious principle in politics, the fault can not be reasonably laid at his door, but must be charged to an unreasonable expectation of what religious principles should accomplish in politics, the world being as it is. It is simply human nature to overlook inconsistencies in one's own party associates according to the ideal standard. To make this apology for Mr. Harrison as a man and a Christian, is simply to say that he shares in fallible human nature, whether regenerate or unregenerate. But the fact

that such an apology must be made for Mr. Harrison, and would probably have to be made for any other President, elected after a similar religious issue had been raised concerning him, emphasizes the poor policy, from the standpoint of the church itself, of raising in politics at all the issue of personal religious character. That issue introduces a new standard of ethics into politics. An official thus elected is judged, not according to the practice of politicians of average standing and morality, but according to the requirements of the ideal standard of conduct to which he has pledged himself.

If the conspicuously religious President were one man in a thousand, and could be depended upon to be governed in every prominent case by the dictates of an ideal standard, then the election of such a man to the Presidency would certainly indicate a nation's "own respect for Christian institutions and truths." But unfortunately a conspicuously religious President cannot be depended upon to prove this one man in a thousand. Every lapse such a President makes accentuates the fact that he is governed in practical politics by the practical code of conventional political morality. The hurtful effect upon the church (in these days, when the conduct of professing Christians is being so closely scanned to discover the practical benefit of making a Christian profession) of thus advertising the failure of the higher standard in practical life must be obvious to all.

It may be noted in passing that many of our Presidents have been professing Christians without in any way involving their Christian professions in current criticism of their official conduct. The world is tolerant and does not expect ideal conduct merely because a man is a member of a church. If he modestly and inconspicuously conforms to the conventional duties of an ordinary church member, and does not lapse into gross immorality or glaring inconsistency, the world takes little note of his avowedly religious character. This is a Christian nation. We all of us like to see those who are prominent in public life pay a decent regard to the outward forms of religion. No political party could afford to honor with high preferment an aggressive agnostic. This is the religious issue in politics of a kind which it is not intended to consider here, but is mentioned to illustrate the opposite extreme of that under consideration. It is, then, when a candidate is either conspicuously religious or conspicuously agnostic that the issue of personal religion is raised in our politics. Under ordinary circumstances a candidate's personal religious character is as little considered as the social standing of his wife or the number of his children.

This is as it should be. In this country of all others we cannot afford to introduce a fictitious standard of criticism, which may be used to palliate or to exaggerate official lapses of conduct. Such palliation or exaggeration must inevitably result from judging men in office by the ideal rather than by the practical standard. We have been considering the question from the standpoint of its effect upon the church; this is considering it from the standpoint of its effect upon the State. Raising the religious issue in politics at once divides us, common citizens of a common country, into hostile camps according to our religious views. For example, when we read how a Presbytery passes resolutions felicitating Mr. Harrison as a Presbyterian elder on the faithful discharge of his duties, those of us who are not in sympathy with Presbyterianism are at once incited to indulge in unjust sneers at the expense of his Presbyterianism. We judge him no longer as a patriotic President, but as a Presbyterian President.

How far this sort of argument may be carried is shown by Lord Mac-

aulay when, as a zealous defender of Whig principles, he wrote of Charles I.:

"We charge him with having broken his coronation oath; and we are told that he kept his marriage vow! We accuse him of having given up his people to the merciless inflictions of the most hotheaded and hardhearted of prelates; and the defence is, that he took his little son on his knee and kissed him! We censure him for having violated the articles of the Petition of Right, after having, for good and valuable consideration, promised to observe them; and we are informed that he was accustomed to hear prayers at six o'clock in the morning!"

ARTHUR REED KIMBALL.

SANITATION *VERSUS* QUARANTINE.

SIR EDWIN ARNOLD, on the occasion of his visit to New York, is reported to have said he did not believe in quarantine. The remark was regarded as hasty and ill-judged, and not as a mature opinion based upon personal experience and observation. But I think I am correct in stating that the distinguished editor of the London *Daily Telegraph* was connected with the educational department of the Province of the Punjab when I first arrived in northern India as a clergyman. If such is the case, Sir Edwin must have witnessed the ravages of the terrible cholera epidemic of 1863, the most virulent outbreak during the British administration of India.

My first experience of an outbreak of cholera was in May, 1865, my second in September, 1867; and during my twenty years' residence at the military station of Peshawar, on the Afghan frontier, I passed through five cholera epidemics, and I can fully indorse Sir Edwin Arnold's opinion regarding the futility of quarantine.

Whilst the Health Department of the New York Harbor deserves the utmost credit for its promptness of action, it must be evident to any one who has had repeated personal experience of Asiatic cholera that cholera in an epidemic form has never reached New York, nor has it yet crossed the Atlantic. Had there been epidemic cholera on the "Normannia," for example, what would have been the condition of the crowd of passengers who were shut up within the steel walls of the infected ship? The treatment of the passengers of the "Normannia" proved beyond question how thoroughly unprepared the Health Department of the city of New York was for the approach of the disease in an epidemic form. The conditions of a military station in India such as Peshawar are not unlike those of a great Atlantic steamer. Everything, even to the drains and cesspools of a cantonment, are under the strictest supervision, and every article of food which crosses its cordon of military police can be closely inspected. But when cholera does enter a military station the methods employed for arresting the spread of the disease are the very reverse of those which obtained on the steamship "Normannia." In India the healthy and strong are removed from the dangers of infection, and not the sick and dying. If there had been epidemic cholera on the steamship "Normannia" the passengers who were left thereon would have been more than decimated.

For a genuine case of Asiatic cholera of epidemic type we may cite the recent outbreak in Karachi, the seaport of Sindh, on the 8th of August last, when in five days there were 798 cases, of which 640 proved fatal. In a seaport city like Karachi sporadic cholera always exists, and no alarm is excited when the disease assumes an epidemic form.

If the reports of the Health Department of the city of New York are

correct there have been ten cases of Asiatic cholera in different parts of the city. The invader has therefore passed quarantine notwithstanding its strict enactments. But these cases could not possibly have been epidemic, for no one will dare to assert that the sanitary conditions of New York city are so perfect and complete as to effect that which the sanitary conditions of a cantonment in India under the strictest military discipline fails to do.

There is a consensus of opinion among those who have carefully watched the invasion of cholera in India that quarantine is well nigh useless. It is sometimes harmful. For instance, it may be questioned whether civilized nations should permit a quarantine which could, as in the case of the "Normannia," shut up hundreds of healthy people in an infected pest trap.

I remember in the year 1867, when cholera had reached Peshawar, a military cordon was placed round the garrison, which was about two miles distant from the infected city. But it proved perfectly useless. In the middle of the night the epidemic entered the artillery barracks and seized the soldiers sleeping on the west side of the barracks, whilst those sleeping on their cots on the east side were unharmed.

During the last twenty years it has been demonstrated, both in the native city of Peshawar, with its 60,000 inhabitants and its garrison of 20,000 troops, that epidemic cholera can be arrested by sanitation rather than by quarantine. Since the British occupation of Peshawar there have been in all eight visitations of epidemic cholera. Three have been of the most virulent type, but a new water supply, more perfect drainage, and a strict sanitary supervision, have vastly reduced the ravages of recent epidemics.

In September, 1867, the corps of medical men at Peshawar found it almost impossible to distinguish between the malarious, or miasmatic fever, so common to the Peshawar valley, and the ordinary Asiatic cholera, and from what I have seen of the reports of the cases which have occurred both on the Atlantic steamers and in the city of New York I should be inclined to believe that real epidemic cholera has not yet crossed the ocean. We must look out for the approach of the enemy in the month of May. Even in the Punjab, with its snowless winters, cholera has never appeared in an epidemic form in what is known as "the cold weather." It would therefore be wiser to attribute the disappearance of cholera from our midst to the approach of the cold weather, rather than to the strictness of quarantine or to the completeness of sanitary precautions.

Taken from the standard of British India, I should say that the unsanitary condition of New York city was about as favorable to the generation of epidemic cholera as that of the city of Karachi. It has been said that New York is one of the best drained cities of the world. This is probably so. But it is singularly malarious, and malaria generates cholera. Its water supply may be good. But I am a water-drinker, and after having drunk the water of four continents I must confess that I have never tasted water more unpleasant to the palate than that which is supplied to the citizens of New York. As to the sanitary conditions of the city nothing could be worse. Within a few yards from my church off East Seventy-fourth street a dead dog lay on the open street for forty-eight hours, although policemen must have passed and repassed the nuisance on their daily beat. At ten o'clock last Monday morning, when walking round the blocks near Seventy-sixth street and Third avenue, I found dust-bins full of offensive garbage exposed to the burning sun, and upon complaint I was told it is not the rule of the city to remove these dust-bins before sunrise. Now, in civilized cities,

whether in India or in England, it is the rule to remove all filth during the hours of the night, and before sunrise, and if the Health Department of this city of New York do not see the necessity of such an arrangement they have certainly not learned the initial principles of sanitation. The expectorating habits of the American citizen are also singularly favorable to the spread of infectious diseases, and in the event of a threatened invasion of epidemic cholera attention should at once be given to the use of disinfectants in the cars of the elevated railroads. A conductor on the Third Avenue Elevated assured me the other day that the public have not the least conception of the filthy habits of passengers on the elevated railroads.

We may conclude that there has been no *epidemic cholera* in the city of New York. But there has been a cholera scare of very gigantic dimensions. It is probable that in the world's history the grim visage of Asiatic cholera has never absorbed so many gallons of printers' ink, nor filled so many columns of newspaper matter. But there is a respite—a respite probably of six months. And let us devoutly pray that those in authority will turn their attention from quarantine to sanitation.

THOMAS P. HUGHES, D. D.

THE NATURALIZATION PROBLEM.

THE immigration and naturalization problems were never of so much importance as they are to-day. Probably there has not been a period in our history in which they have received so large an amount of public attention as they are receiving now. Not the habits, national prejudices, and ideas of government of a considerable part of one nation, but of fifty nations, must be overcome, and their language and allegiance changed in order that the United States may absorb all these new arrivals and work them over into American citizens. The history of the world does not mention another nation which has been called upon to solve problems of this kind in anything like the virulent form in which they are presented to us. The chronicle of the events of the earth gives many instances of one nation having been absorbed by another. But not in the annals of mankind has one people been overrun by all the other nations of the earth with an army which is reinforced every week by a body of recruits numbering more than the whole of many a conquering army in mediæval times.

A few of the more important features of the naturalization problem, as they appear in New York city, will be found both interesting and instructive. This is the port of all the ports in the country where not only the largest number of immigrants arrive each year, but where more naturalizing is done than at any other place in the Union.

Some time previous to 1872 the issuing of naturalization papers was characterized by the grossest frauds, and the records are in a chaotic condition. It has been estimated that in the year 1868 alone somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000 fraudulent naturalization papers were put into circulation. Many of these certificates, it should be explained, never saw a court or a judge, and were forgeries pure and simple.

A general purging of the city government followed soon afterwards with the breaking up of the Tweed "ring," and since that time, until within a few years, no charges have been made that any considerable number of fraudulent certificates of naturalization have been issued. Recently numer-

ous complaints of that character have been recorded and some of the offenders have been punished.

From the records of the Superior Court it is learned that in the last twenty years representatives of thirty-eight nations have disavowed their allegiance to the land of their birth to become subjects of the United States. This, it should be remembered, is the record of one court alone. In the same period there were 76,537 persons naturalized in this court. The records of the Court of Common Pleas would about duplicate this showing. In the United States Court the number is very much smaller, owing to the double cost. These three are the only courts where naturalization papers are issued in New York city.

As might be expected, in years of Presidential elections three and occasionally four times as many citizens are made as there are in any one of the three years immediately preceding or following. The year 1891 was a marked exception to that rule. No Presidential election was held last fall, and yet more than 9,000 citizens were made in the Superior Court alone last year. This is double the highest number made in any previous non-Presidential year since 1872.

An important feature of the question is found in the extremely large number of persons naturalized in October of each year in comparison with the grand total for the year. According to the law in New York State no naturalized citizen can vote unless he has secured his naturalization papers at least ten days before election day. To prevent frauds at the polls, through the carelessness of the election inspectors in looking at the dates of naturalization certificates, no papers are issued in the ten days immediately preceding election day. In spite of this fact we have the apparent paradox that in this one shortened month more than two and one-half times as much naturalizing is done than is accomplished in the remaining eleven full months of the year! For example, in the period already mentioned 55,061 persons were naturalized in the twenty months of October, leaving only 21,476 for the remaining 220 months. In other words, the average for eleven months each year has been 97 persons naturalized each month, while for each October the average has been 2,753 persons.

This condition of affairs is due largely to the institutions known as "naturalization bureaus," which are established each fall by both the principal political parties. The promoters of these concerns go into the slums and drag out every semblance of a man that they can find, pay for his certificate, find some one who will swear that he has been in the country five years, and, no doubt, in many cases, offer him a pecuniary reward for supporting the party at the polls.

These embryotic citizens whom they unearth are, in very many cases, totally ignorant of our forms of government, and their ignorance is only exceeded by their indifference as to the result of an election, or as to the principles involved. Each person, to become a citizen, must have a witness who will swear that he has known the applicant in this country for five years, and that during that time he has "behaved as a man of good moral character, is attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."

Not the slightest difficulty is experienced in securing plenty of these witnesses. They were so bold last fall that they were hanging about the corridors of the County Court House, and would offer to be witnesses for a small amount. Why the political parties should be allowed to pay for the

naturalization papers of these men it is difficult to understand. The politicians certainly would not pay even the small sum which each certificate costs unless they expected to get in return a vote for each paper secured.

While our indignation is reaching a white heat, however, over the abuses of the naturalization laws in the East, it might be well to look away from our immediate homes on the Atlantic coast and observe for a moment the methods of procedure in the West. The main point for which the politicians seem to be working is to make "voters" as distinguished from "citizens." Under the law and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the different States have enacted regulations governing the qualifications for voters. These rules, it must be kept in mind, are for the government of those casting ballots for Presidential electors, members of Congress, and all elective federal officers, as well as for State officials. Thus we have the anomaly of an alien who may not vote in one State going a few miles into another, where his ballot is counted for the same candidates that he was not allowed to vote for in the first State.

It is due to this vicious system that we are treated to the melancholy sight of a hundred Italian laborers landing at Ellis Island one day, being marched to one or another of the courts the next morning to declare their intentions of becoming citizens, being loaded into cars in the afternoon, voting for federal officers in some Western town a month later, and returning to the town of their birth two or three years afterwards, to live in practical idleness the remainder of their lives. Many of them never had the slightest intention of becoming American citizens; they knew scarcely anything, and cared less, about the meaning of the operation they had passed through.

From the experience in this city I should say that to correct abuses—

First, We should have uniform qualifications for voters for federal officers throughout the Union.

Second, The naturalization bureaus should be suppressed.

Third, Judges should exercise more care in carrying out the naturalization laws.

H. B. BRADBURY.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXXIII.

DECEMBER, 1892.

THE NEW HOUSE OF COMMONS AND THE IRISH QUESTION.*

BY THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

THE House of Commons by a majority of forty has passed a vote of want of confidence in the Unionist government; Lord Salisbury has resigned; and Mr. Gladstone is at the head of an administration pledged to the principles of Home Rule. It is inevitable, under such circumstances, that all who, on either side of the Atlantic, take an interest in the future of Ireland, should abandon themselves to speculation on the ultimate result of these striking incidents, and though such speculation, if it seeks too boldly to penetrate the secrets of the distant future, can hardly be otherwise than barren, it may nevertheless not be without its use if it enables us more clearly to apprehend the conditions of the problem we have immediately to face.

Let it be noted, then, in the first place, that the division which took place in the House of Commons on the night of August 11 was the climax of an electoral struggle which has raged without intermission for five years. It may be doubted whether at any time in British history efforts at once so continuous and so intense were ever put forth by both parties for so long a period. It is certain at least that nothing of the kind has taken place since the last Reform Bill established household suffrage as the general electoral principle in counties and boroughs alike. Many momentous general elections have on former occasions been deter-

* The reader is requested to bear in mind the fact that Mr. Balfour's article was written immediately after the general election.—ED. N. A. R.

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

mined largely by abstention; not the men who voted, but the men who refused to vote were the authors of the change which placed in power new ministers and another party. But this has emphatically not been the case in the general election of 1892. The polls have been enormous; and there is no evidence that any class or section of the population, on either side in politics, was lukewarm or indifferent. The political eagerness of the constituencies is so far faithfully represented in the House of Commons which they elected; and the lobbies on the night of the division contained a larger proportion of members than has, I believe, ever before been collected together during the long history of the House of Commons. Three members, and three members only, were absent out of 668, and of these, two were ill and one was on the high seas.

It might, perhaps, be supposed that the verdict thus given with every circumstance of deliberation was both unequivocal and final. The case, it might well be thought, has been fully heard; judgment has been pronounced by a court admitted to be competent, and from which there is no appeal; and nothing further can remain for the Unionist party but to admit that, whether right or wrong, they are unsuccessful; to make their bow, and to retire with what grace they can until their successors shall have carried their Home Rule policy to a practical result, and new issues shall have risen above the horizon of party politics. These, however, are assuredly not the sentiments of the Unionist party. They admit neither the premises nor the conclusion. They do not acknowledge that the verdict of the country is unambiguous, still less do they consider it to be final; while, in their view, the victory of their opponents is accompanied by circumstances which make it almost equivalent to a defeat.

That if it be a victory, it is a victory most disappointing to the victors, will at all events not be disputed. Mr. Gladstone was accustomed to entertain the public and to occupy the leisure of opposition with elaborate calculations, based upon the figures of bye-elections, as to what majority he had a right to expect. His most modest anticipations were enormously in excess of what he has actually obtained, while on the very eve of the declaration of the polls Mr. Herbert Gladstone announced to a French special correspondent that their expected majority ranged, if my memory serves me, somewhere between 100 and 180.

For my own part, I never was of opinion that these sanguine prophecies, illusory as they have proved themselves to be, were on the face of them absurd. It does not, in our existing system, require many abstentions or many conversions to turn a large majority into a small minority, and both reasoning and experience show that there must be many causes at work during the course of a long parliament by which such a result is likely to be brought about. An administration which holds office for six years cannot but disappoint many hopes; cannot but arouse many enmities; cannot but give occasion to much hostile comment, well or ill founded. During all that period it is always the object of criticism, often of misrepresentation, sometimes of calumny. While its own shortcomings are fresh in the memory of all men, the shortcomings of its predecessor have faded into a historic past; the performance of its members is compared, not with the performance of the rivals whom they have supplanted, but with the promises of the rivals who hope to supplant them. The comparison, therefore, is never made between two realities, but is always between a reality darkened by misrepresentation and a fiction illumined by hope. It need create no great surprise that the fiction is very commonly preferred.

It is to causes such as these that we must in the main attribute the immense majorities obtained in 1868 by Mr. Gladstone over Mr. Disraeli; in 1874 by Mr. Disraeli over Mr. Gladstone; and in 1880 by Mr. Gladstone again over Mr. Disraeli. It was not unnatural to suppose that what had happened to many governments before, after a prolonged tenure of power, would happen to the government of Lord Salisbury, and that the relatively small fraction of the population who determine the results of general elections, and who in these discussions are always dignified by the name of the "Country," would again transfer their affection and their support from the gentlemen who were *in* to the gentlemen who were *out*. To do those responsible for the management of the Gladstonian party justice, they were not slack in supplying every artificial aid to the furtherance of this natural process. No doubt in every election some things are done by both parties which had better not be done, and many things are said which had better not be said. Yet I cannot think that I am misled by party prejudices when I assert that during the recent electoral contests, which in

some sense may be said to have been going on continuously for five years, the Home Rule candidates indulged in a license of invective and misrepresentation which has not often dishonored party conflicts in this country. I do not believe that in the large centres of population the violent attacks upon the late Irish administration did much harm to the Unionist cause. They began too early ; they were continued too long ; and they were too easily contradicted. The same, however, cannot be said of many of the misrepresentations, often merely personal, by which it was sought to influence the county elections. There the populations to be dealt with had less political experience than the voters in the towns ; they were widely scattered, and a well selected fiction, distributed from many centres shortly before the poll, it was almost impossible to expose in time to deprive it of its power for evil.

It is not, however, upon electioneering details, which can have but little interest for American readers, that I desire now to dwell. It is sufficient for my present purpose if I have made it clear, in the first place, that there are constant forces at work which tend, after any sufficient interval, to transfer power from one party to the other ; and also that, in the case of the recent general election, these forces by no means acted in the manner or to the extent desired and expected by the Home Rule parties. The anticipated majorities of 170, 120, or 100 shrank to the modest proportions of 40, and, as I shall proceed to show, the inherent weakness of that majority is by no means measured by the mere paucity of its numbers. For, whereas on ordinary questions and in ordinary times it matters nothing from what part of the United Kingdom any ministry derives the votes by which it is retained in office, in 1892, and on the Home Rule question, this becomes a matter of fundamental importance. No doubt long and even powerful administrations have been and may again be carried on with the assistance of party majorities of much less than 40, but they have been majorities fairly homogeneous in character, and fairly united in organization.

This description, most assuredly, does not apply to the Home Rule majority in the present House of Commons.

The English members who follow Mr. Gladstone are divided from the Nationalist members representing Irish constituencies, by tradition, by principle, and by organization. The Nationalist

members who follow Mr. McCarthy are divided from those who follow Mr. Redmond, not only by organization, but by the recent memory of bitter wrongs, by personal prejudices more powerful than public principles. Of these three parties the McCarthyites are, for the purpose of the present argument, the most important, for they hold the balance of power, and can at any moment put the Gladstonian government in the minority. In what manner they will use this power it is at present impossible to prophesy. There are many of them, I doubt not, with whom Home Rule is merely a pious opinion, and who would be quite content to go on indefinitely as part of the Gladstonian tail, abundantly satisfied to see Home Rule relegated to an humble place in the Newcastle programme, provided that they could in the meanwhile keep the Unionist government out of office, and control the dispensation of Irish patronage.

But though this is a policy to which perhaps they would not be averse, it is not in all respects an easy one to carry out. They would be met by difficulties both in Ireland and at Westminster. The supposition that their Home Rule creed sat loosely upon them would, if it once came home to their constituents, do them infinite harm, and the followers of Mr. Redmond infinite good. It would not be easy for them in the House of Commons to support an Irish administration, even of a Home Rule government, without falsifying promises which they have made, and destroying expectations which they have encouraged in their Irish dupes. If during the past twelve years Separation or Home Rule has been their end, their means have invariably been derived from the unscrupulous employment of the weapons furnished them by the agrarian difficulty. They have not hesitated to preach doctrines on the subject of property which in every civilized country in the world would be regarded as absurd, and to enforce these doctrines by methods which in every civilized country in the world would be punished as illegal. No doubt Mr. Gladstone's government will do everything they can to minimise the difficulties which must arise between themselves and their embarrassing allies; but if society is to continue at all, these difficulties cannot be wholly obliterated. A landlord must still be permitted to get rid of a tenant who declines to pay his rent. The new Chief Secretary must at least go through the form of protecting the tenant who takes a farm from

which his predecessor has been evicted. The illegal and criminal practices, for which Mr. Gladstone and his friends found it so easy to devise soft-sounding synonyms when they had to be dealt with by their political opponents, can hardly be ignored by Ministers responsible for the government of the country. It is true, no doubt, that agrarian crime has greatly diminished under the steady pressure of firm administration during the last few years. It is also true that the Irish politicians who thought it at one time to be their interest to encourage agrarian crime will now find it in their interest to repress it. Nevertheless, cases can hardly fail to occur in which the Irish government will have to choose between a policy which sacrifices the rights and liberties of Irish citizens, and one which is inconsistent with the avowed teachings of the party on which they are dependent for their official existence. If they choose the first alternative they must eventually lose character in England; if they choose the second they will certainly embarrass, and may possibly alienate, an essential portion of their Home Rule majority.

These and other difficulties which might easily be mentioned are not likely to prove inconsiderable; but they are small, indeed, compared to the legislative fences that have to be climbed over or scrambled through before the goal of Home Rule is finally reached.

In the first place, it has to be noted that, so far as Great Britain is concerned, the Home Rule party is in a minority; and, so far as England alone is concerned, it is in a relatively small minority. In other words, England, even after a general election fought under the disadvantageous conditions referred to at the beginning of this article, is still vehemently opposed to the Home Rule policy; while if Scotland and Wales take a different view, it is not so much because they are in favor of Home Rule, as because their old political traditions, or their interests in the Scotch or Welsh measures promised somewhere or other in the Newcastle programme, prevent them withdrawing their support altogether from Mr. Gladstone. Now the difficulties which must beset any government which attempts wholly to reconstruct the constitutional relations between England and Ireland against the will of the former are necessarily great, and are much greater since Mr. Gladstone has authoritatively promised to retain the Irish members at Westminster after Home Rule is granted. For-

merly it might have been said plausibly, however untruly, that Home Rule for Ireland was in the main a question which only concerned the Irish. This can be said no longer. If the Irish are to send one hundred representatives to the parliament at Westminster, while England is to send no representatives to the parliament in Dublin, it follows that the Irish can intervene in our affairs while we cannot intervene in theirs. They can not only vote upon the details of English legislation, which in no way concerns them; they can not only vote taxes to which they contribute not one farthing, but (which is far more serious) they can determine against the will of the English people the political complexion of the ministry by which that people is to be governed. I am not now concerned to prove that such a proposal, if really carried out, would make our constitution the laughingstock of the world; I am only concerned to show your readers that in this kind of Home Rule England is at least as much concerned as Ireland, and that England has pronounced her objection to it with at least as much decision as Ireland has pronounced her approval of it.

On Nationalist principles this decisive verdict of one of the nations affected would appear to be fatal to the cause of Home Rule; yet it is not from the hostile English majority alone that Mr. Gladstone's English difficulties are likely to arise. The English minority also may find that their assent to an Irish parliament has been wrung from them on false pretences. In truth two very different schemes of Home Rule have been presented to the English and Irish people respectively. The Irish have been led to believe that they are to have a parliament and an executive practically independent and supreme so far as Ireland is concerned. The English have been taught to believe that, after Home Rule has been granted, the British parliament will still retain a supreme controlling power, to be exercised if and when, in their opinion, the Irish parliament abuses the powers which have been granted to it. The difference here indicated is fundamental. Both ideals cannot by any possibility be satisfied, and when the bill comes to be laid on the table of the House it must inevitably be found, either that the English give more than they bargained for or that the Irish receive less than they expected. Which of the two sections among his followers will ultimately prove to have been the dupes Mr. Gladstone himself

could not, probably, at the present moment inform us. The result will doubtless be determined by the "higgling" of the political "market," and by the estimate which he may form of the relative obstinacy of the two parties, who cannot both get what they want, but who must both be induced to support him if he is to retain the "confidence" of the House of Commons.

It is impossible not to sympathize with the British Ministry who are endeavoring to follow Mr. Gladstone in the Home Rule policy. In doing so they have been compelled to abandon, suddenly and completely, at the word of command, the long cherished traditions of their party. They went to bed one night good Unionists; they woke next morning to find that, at the bidding of their leader, they had suddenly and unawares been turned into Home Rulers. Their whole political vocabulary had to be altered. They had to curse what they had formerly blessed, and to bless what they had formerly cursed. Their saints were turned into criminals and their criminals into saints. Their very speeches and election addresses, those only a few weeks old, became abominable to them.

Such an operation, performed even on the smallest scale, is not usually agreeable to fallen human nature; and the scale upon which the Liberal party have performed it must be admitted to be nothing short of heroic. I do not suppose that in the field of politics, where such manœuvres have not infrequently been practised, a change of front so rapid and so complete was ever effected before. That it should have been effected at all, even at the cost of the Liberal Unionists' secession, is surely a remarkable testimony both to the ascendancy of Mr. Gladstone and to the strength of party discipline. But something more than this I apprehend was necessary to secure the result; and this something is to be found in the illusory hopes which they have based upon what appears, and has always appeared to me, to be a total misapprehension of the true character of the problem which had to be solved. What the English follower of Mr. Gladstone has persuaded himself that he will get from Home Rule is, in the first place, a settlement of the Irish difficulty, and in the second place the satisfaction of a legitimate Irish demand. To gain this object he has been content to sacrifice his own political past and the future of his co-religionists in Ireland; and yet if anything can be certain in political prophecy it is certain that the first of

these objects will not be attained, and that the very idea of the second is based upon historical misconception.

What is the root and essence of the Home Rule movement which prevails among two-thirds of the population of Ireland, and which is so violently opposed by the other one-third ? Some people talk as if it was the desire of an oppressed minority for a fair share in the management of an Empire of which they bore their proportion of the burdens ; others talk as if it was the longing of an ancient people to have restored to them the constitution which they once enjoyed, and of which, through dark years of national eclipse, they have always cherished the recollection. Both theories are unhistorical and even absurd. As regards the first, it is enough, perhaps, to say that the Irish at this moment enjoy a larger proportionate share in the management of the United Kingdom than either England or Scotland. They enjoy more than their fare share of Imperial time, and more than their fair share of Imperial money. Not less inconsistent with the fact is the view that they desire some restoration of the institution formerly enjoyed by their nation. There never has been any ancient order of things in Ireland which could be made to do duty as the ideal of modern Nationalist aspirations, unless the condition of general anarchy and inter-tribal warfare which in ancient times existed outside the "Pale" can be so described. There was, indeed, a time when a separate parliament sat in Dublin, but it was a parliament founded for English immigrants by England, filled by men of English blood, and always more or less controlled by men dependent on an English House of Commons. It was a landlord parliament and a Protestant parliament ; a parliament profoundly attached to "revolution" principles and all that "revolution" principles implied in Ireland. It would be a miracle indeed if such a parliament should have taken real root in the hearts of a population which had no part in its deliberations, and who were divided from those who had, by the profound gulf produced by the memories of civil wars, successive confiscations, mutual persecutions, and penal laws. In truth, nothing less than Mr. Gladstone's ingenuity could blind him and his followers to the fact that the historic root of the Home Rule movement is not to be found in any memories of an Irish parliament, but in the rebellions and attempted rebellions which have from time to time taken place against the

English connection; rebellions which themselves are in the direct line of descent from the ancient struggles between the Irish Celts and English invaders, and which derive their strength from the agrarian discontents born of the unforgotten wrongs inflicted by the great confiscations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Those who are content to put aside the Gladstonian legend and to consider the true lessons to be deduced from the version of Irish history which I have just indicated, will easily understand why no scheme of Home Rule which England could consent to grant could ever put an end to the Irish question or be the means of conferring a measure of "justice" upon Ireland. For they will see that the Nationalist movement is really based upon two diverse, though allied, elements. It is based partly upon the desire to shake off the connection with England, partly on the desire to remedy the wrongs inflicted by former confiscations by adding a new one to the number. In so far as the first of these still subsists by its own native strength and vigor, it would not be and could not be satisfied by the granting of a parliament even nominally subordinate to the Imperial parliament, and from whose deliberations are to be excluded the consideration of many subjects (such for instance as taxation and tariffs) which are freely granted to our self-governing colonies. But I believe myself that this feeling, though among certain sections of the population undoubtedly real, is in process, or, at least until the agitation of 1880, *was* in process, of rapid conversion into a harmless and purely sentimental affection for a condition of things supposed once on a time to have existed, but which no one in seriousness desired to see restored. In a generation it would have become as innocuous as the Jacobitism of 1760, and would have had as little in it hostile to the unity of the United Kingdom as have the feelings which we Scotchmen cherish for the heroism of Wallace or the victories of Bruce.

Unfortunately, this patriotic sentiment is in Ireland inextricably associated with agrarian discontents. From this, and from this alone, did it derive the virulence which has characterized its different manifestations during the last twelve years. But it is plain that the Imperial Parliament can never allow the perpetration in the nineteenth century of the iniquities that were barely tolerated in the seventeenth. There must be no new dispossession of the owners of the soil, no repetition, under modern forms, of

ancient injustices. But if the Home Rule Bill is neither to fulfil the wishes of those who, in their own phrase, wish to see Ireland a nation among the nations, nor the demands of those who want other people's land, how can it pretend to offer a final settlement of the Irish question ? how can it satisfy the aspirations of that part of the population of Ireland which is understood to demand it ?

In my view the remedy proposed by Mr. Gladstone must aggravate the disease it is intended to cure; for it is based upon a wrong diagnosis and conceived under a complete misapprehension of the life-history of the patient. No mere manipulation of the constitutional machinery can do any good. What is required is gradually to work the agrarian poison out of the system, and to trust to time to complete the international amalgamation which is already so far advanced. Let us see that grievances are removed, that the law is obeyed, and that individual rights are maintained ; but, while property in land is firmly supported, let us endeavor at the same time to facilitate, as far as possible, the acquisition of that property by the great mass of the occupying tenants. If this policy be consistently carried out, I make no question but that the process by which every great country in Europe has grown into a compact whole out of the scattered fragments left by the great storms of the middle ages, would at no distant date unite every section of the Irish people in the same sentiment of loyalty and affection to the Parliament of the United Kingdom as now prevails in Antrim or in Kent. While it seems to me equally certain that any of the inconsistent schemes described under the common name of Home Rule would, if carried into effect, inevitably aggravate every antipathy and prolong every evil which at present perplexes us in the treatment of the Irish question.

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

WHEN IS THE POPE INFALLIBLE?

BY THE REV. S. M. BRANDI, S. J.

THE infallibility of the Pope has always been the main point of controversy between Catholics and Protestants. From the Augsburg confession of faith in 1550 to the framing of the articles of religion by the Reformed Episcopal church in 1875, there has scarcely been a Protestant evangelical creed formulated, in which this infallibility has not been in a greater or less degree explicitly denied. On the other hand, Catholics have never ceased proclaiming it. Such has been the case at all times, but especially since 1870, when the Pope's infallibility was solemnly defined by the Vatican Council.

Numerous statements of the meaning and philosophy of this doctrine, written by its friends and by its foes, have not been wanting; yet something seems to have been overlooked. There are many persons who dislike controversy. They have a strong sense of justice and fair play, and, rightly or wrongly, they wish to judge for themselves. What these readers want is a clear and unvarnished exposition of the doctrine in question; above all, in this subject-matter, they want something of which they can take hold, viz., a definite statement of some recent concrete papal utterances, to which that doctrine applies.

Papal infallibility is defined, by Catholic theologians, to be a supernatural *assistance* of the Holy Ghost, whereby the Pope, as head of the whole church, is preserved free from error, whenever he defines a doctrine that belongs to faith or morals. Hence the reader will easily understand that, in Catholic theology, an infallible Pope does not mean one gifted with inspiration, or commissioned to reveal to the Catholic world new dogmas. The gift of inspiration is chiefly positive, whilst the gift of infallibility is negative; infallibility is *only* an assistance securing the Pope

from the possibility of declaring error to be truth, and truth error. Moreover, all Catholic theologians agree in denying the existence of any new Catholic revelation after the times of the Apostles. The special assistance of the Holy Ghost is given to the Pope for the *only* purpose of preserving, explaining, and defending the revelation already made to, and through, the Apostles.

Nor does an infallible Pope mean one who is confirmed in the happy state of sanctifying grace, and who, therefore, is sinless, or cannot sin. Impeccability and infallibility are two gifts entirely distinct. Impeccability is a gift of the will, infallibility is a gift of the understanding; impeccability implies a permanent gift that makes the receiver agreeable to God, and is given chiefly for the good of the person that receives it; while infallibility is a transitory gift, gratuitously given for the good of the universal church, and only then when the Pope, as its supreme Doctor, is teaching the church.

Hence an infallible Pope cannot be said to be one who can never err in his private conversation or teachings; or who cannot make any mistake in politics, government, etc. For the gift of infallibility, as held by Catholics, belongs to the Pope *only* in his official capacity, as supreme teacher of the church, and *only* when, in virtue of his Apostolic power, he defines a doctrine that belongs to faith or morals. This and no other is the subject-matter of the Pope's infallible teaching.

This last point is the most important and deserves a little more attention. A doctrine may belong to faith in two different ways, viz.: 1, *directly*, if it be a revealed truth; and 2, *indirectly*, if it be a truth not revealed, but one which is in contact with revelation, and is necessary for the custody, exposition, development and defence of the latter. Such are, *e. g.*, certain philosophical doctrines about God, or the soul of man, or society, or man's rights and duties, etc.; also some *facts* which, because of their intimate connection with a dogmatic truth, are called "dogmatic facts." By the unanimous teaching of all Catholic theologians, these facts as well as the revealed truths are within the sphere of the Pope's infallible teaching.

A misconception is possible here. Every truth belonging to faith or morals may be infallibly defined by the Pope; but from this it does not follow that every truth infallibly defined by the

Pope is a dogma of the Catholic faith, and, therefore, to be believed with a divine and Catholic faith. To be a dogma of Catholic faith, a doctrine must be a *truth revealed* by God, which the Pope defines to be such. If the doctrine or fact defined be *not* a revealed truth, then, although it too must be unhesitatingly believed, it is so believed *only* with an *ecclesiastical* faith, that is to say, with a faith that has for its motive "the authority of God's Church defining," not of God Himself directly revealing.

These few remarks being clearly understood it will not be very difficult to understand the Catholic answer to the question: "When does the Pope speak infallibly?" The Pope speaks infallibly (or, as it is also said, *ex cathedra*) when all the conditions required by the declaration of the Vatican Council are verified. These conditions are four in number; and it is the fulfilment of these conditions that constitutes the standard or criterion whereby the reader may with all certainty and security discriminate between a concrete papal utterance, to which infallibility belongs, and another to which such a character is not attached.

The conditions are: 1. The Pope, as already explained, must speak as Pope, *i. e.*, as head of the Church. It matters not whether his utterance be by word of mouth or by writing; and, if written, whether it be found in an encyclical, or constitution, or syllabus, or apostolic letter, etc. Hence, if in reading, *e. g.*, one of the Pope's encyclicals I find the Pope therein expressly stating that he speaks "in virtue of the apostolic power given to him," there can be no doubt that the first condition required for an infallible utterance is therein verified. 2. The Pope must speak *for* the whole Church; it makes no difference whether he speaks *to* one bishop or *to* one diocese. Hence, if it be clear that the Pope, in the document I am perusing, addresses himself "to the whole Catholic world," or, while addressing himself to some particular bishop or church, speaks so "that all may know what it is that *every Catholic* is bound to hold, retain and profess," then it is made clear that the second condition also is verified. 3. The Pope must *define* the doctrine; that is, he must pass a final judgment, giving sufficient indication of his intention to oblige the interior assent of Catholics. Should he not do that, but leave the question unsettled, or merely state what seems (*videtur*) to him to be more likely, his utterance would not be such as to claim infallibility. Finally, 4. The doctrine thus defined by the Pope

must be one which is contained within the sphere of the subject-matter of infallibility; it must be a truth belonging to faith or morality, in either of the ways above explained.

It would, therefore, be a perversion of the Vatican declaration to hold as infallible every act of the Pope, and every expression which he may ever have uttered. The definition of the Vatican Council extends *solely* to those utterances of the Pope *in past*, as well as *in future times*, wherein the four given conditions combine. And, even then, it is the doctrine defined, and that alone which Catholics hold to be infallible; preambles, arguments, *obiter dicta*, all these are considered as external to the purpose of defining, and therefore external to the obligation of belief.

We proceed now to what may appear to some the most important, if not the most interesting part, of our statement, viz.: the application of the rules laid down by the definition of the Vatican Council to some of the utterances of the two last popes, Pius IX. and Leo XIII. This application, which in many cases is evident, is far from being *always* easy. The difficulty, experienced by some, is often subjective rather than objective; but it is sufficient, nevertheless, to explain a certain difference of opinion that has existed with regard to the theological value of some pontifical utterances, or the *definability*, as it is called, of certain doctrines.

Thus there have been a few theologians, who, admitting "the Syllabus" of Pope Pius IX. to be a document of great authority, to which all Catholics are bound to submit, yet because, *in their judgment*, all the conditions required for an *ex-cathedra* document were not therein clearly verified, have denied it to be an *ex-cathedra* act, and therefore to be a concrete infallible utterance.

Even now the question is noted in some of the English and American Reviews: Whether the doctrine, which holds that the temporal power, under the present circumstances of Church and State, is necessary for the Head of the Church unto the free and independent exercise of his Apostolic authority, is a truth defined, or that may be defined? Were we to treat this question *ex professo* we should answer it in the affirmative; for the Popes, and notably Pius IX. and Leo XIII., in their official capacity, and not merely as private persons, have repeatedly and solemnly affirmed the necessity of the temporal power; they have declared that "all Catholics must firmly hold it," and, moreover,

there seems to be no doubt that the doctrine in question, although not revealed, is connected with one which is revealed, viz.: "the free and independent exercise of the Apostolic authority all over the world." From the *Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council* we learn that, by order of Pope Pius IX., a *schema* or draft of the *solemn* definition, that the temporal power is necessary to the Head of the Church, was prepared by the Episcopal committee, and submitted to the Bishops of the Council. It was only the events of 1870, which, depriving the Pope of his temporal power, and, consequently obliging him to suspend the work of the Council, precluded for a time the actual definition of this point, as well as many other important ones.

A clear instance of a concrete, infallible Papal utterance is to be found in the "Bulla Dogmatica" of Pius IX. on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Here are the words:

"By authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and our own, we declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, was by a singular privilege of Almighty God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of mankind, preserved free from every stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and is therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Wherefore if any—which God forbid—presume in their hearts to think differently from what we have defined, let them know and be assured that they are condemned by their own judgment, have suffered shipwreck concerning the faith, and have departed from the unity of the Church."

The four conditions required for an *ex-cathedra* utterance are here evidently fulfilled. The doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary being defined as "a doctrine revealed by God," Catholics hold it as a dogma of the Catholic faith.

The Encyclical "*Quanta Cura*" (A. D. 1874) of the same Pontiff Pius IX. is one which is acknowledged and accepted by all Catholic theologians as a document to which, under the definition, infallibility belongs: hence they consider the opinions and doctrines therein condemned by the Pope as infallibly condemned. The words of the Pope could not be clearer or more to the point:

"In the midst of so many pernicious opinions, we are mindful of our apostolic office, and being exceedingly solicitous for our holy religion, for sound doctrine and the welfare of souls intrusted to our care, we have judged it to be our duty to raise once more our apostolic voice. By our apostolic

authority, therefore, we reprobate, proscribe, and condemn all the wicked opinions and doctrines expressly mentioned in these Letters, and we will, and command, that they be held as reprobated, proscribed and condemned by all the children of the Catholic Church.

The opinions and doctrines expressly mentioned and condemned are: Naturalism, Indifferentism, Liberalism, Socialism, Communism, etc., and "the doctrine of those who contend that without sin, and without any sacrifice of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience may be refused to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See (provided only they do not touch the dogmas of faith and morals), the object of which is declared to concern the Church's general good, and her rights and discipline."

Two other equally clear and indubitable cases of infallible decisions, which have for their object a truth not revealed, but which is connected with a revealed doctrine, are to be found in the Encyclical "*Etsi Multa*" of Pius IX. (A. D. 1873). In this document the Pope, after protesting against the insults that were heaped upon his See "by lawless men who are the enemies of religion," speaks of the evils that afflicted, at the same time, the church in Switzerland and Germany. He first enumerates the laws passed against religion by the Swiss government—laws whereby the Bishop is made subject to civil authority in the administration of his diocese, in the exercise of his Episcopal jurisdiction, and in the delegation of his powers to others, whereby priests are strictly forbidden to exercise any priestly office or accept any power or dignity which would be superior to that intrusted to them by the will of the people; and are obliged to take an oath which implies apostasy from the Catholic faith. All these anti-catholic laws the Pope, "in virtue of his apostolic authority solemnly reproves and condemns, defining at the same time that the oath which they require is both unlawful and sacrilegious."

The other "concrete infallible utterance" contained in the Encyclical refers to the validity of the election, and the lawfulness of the consecration, of Joseph U. Reinkens as Bishop of "the Old Catholics" of Germany. It will suffice to quote the words of the Pope to see that nothing is wanting for an *ex-cathedra* utterance:

"Occupying, although unworthy, the supreme chair of Peter, we, in order to uphold the Catholic faith and to preserve and defend the unity of the Church, following in the footsteps of our predecessors and of the sacred canons, do, in virtue of the (apostolic) power given us by heaven, declare the

election of the said Reinkens to have been unlawful, vain, and utterly void, and pronounce his consecration to have been sacrilegious, and, as such, we condemn and detest it."

From Leo XIII., the present Pope, who in 1878 succeeded Pius IX. in the chair of Peter, there have emanated so many Encyclicals and Letters, etc., that to examine them all would require a very large volume. A few instances of his infallible utterances will suffice. In his very first Encyclical of April 21, 1878, there is one such utterance, whereby His Holiness "from the Apostolic Chair of Truth (*ex cathedra*) receives and confirms all the sentences of condemnation, passed by his predecessors and especially by Pius IX., on all the modern errors," such as Pantheism, Agnosticism, Rationalism, etc.

The Encyclical "*Diuturnum Illud*" of June, 1881, leaves no doubt as to its claim to infallibility in what it teaches, concerning (1) the origin of the civil power, and its duties towards those for whose welfare it exists, and (2) the obedience which is due to it by those who are under its rule. Here are the words of the Pontiff:

"As we are by the favor of God appointed to rule the Catholic Church, the keeper and interpreter of the doctrines of Christ, we judge it to be the duty of our authority to proclaim publicly the doctrine which every man is bound by Catholic truth to hold on the question of civil power."

And having fully explained what "Catholic truth" teaches on this subject, the Pope concludes with the following words addressed to his venerable brethren, the bishops of Christendom:

"Endeavor and provide that all these points, which are taught by the Catholic Church, on the civil power and on the duty of paying it obedience, be made known to all, and observed by all."

The intelligent reader, if he will apply the rules given by the Vatican Council, may find a few more of these utterances in the Encyclical "*Quod Apostolici Muneris*" (December 28, 1878) against socialism, and in the Encyclical "*Immortale Dei*" (November 1, 1885) on the Christian constitution of States. In the former the Pope, "as required by the nature of his apostolic ministry," condemns the socialistic system, "as being utterly opposed to the doctrine of Christ;" and in the latter, "knowing that he is the apostolic ambassador to all the faithful," and "judging it to be the duty of his apostolic office," he proposes to all "what the Catholic Church teaches and prescribes on this question," viz.:

"That public authority (ultimately) is not from the people but from God; that rebellion against legitimate authority is against reason; that neither

the individual nor the State may dispense with religious duties, or be indifferent with regard to the various forms of worship; that the *unbridled* freedom of thought, and of the press, can never be a right, or deserve favor and protection, etc."

Besides these Encyclicals, there are others that might be examined in the same manner, to determine which possess the qualifications required for an infallible utterance, and which do not possess them. Leo XIII. has written on almost every subject. He has addressed to the Catholic world *Encyclicals* on "Scholastic Philosophy" (Aug. 4, 1879); on "Christian Marriage" (Feb. 10, 1880); on "The Jubilee" (March 12, 1881); on "The Society for the Propagation of the Faith" (Dec. 3, 1880); on "St. Joseph" (Aug. 15, 1889); on "The Chief Duties of Christian Subjects" (Jan. 10, 1890); on "The Condition of Labor" (May 15, 1891); on "The Necessity of Prayer," and again on "The Rosary" (Sept. 22, 1891). We have from the same Pontiff *Apostolic letters* on "The Reformation of the Order of St. Basil" (May 12, 1882); a *Constitution* on the state of Regulars in England and Scotland (May 5, 1881); two *Decrees of Canonization of Saints* (Dec. 8, 1881, and Jan. 15, 1888. Theologians hold the Pope to be infallible in these decrees. Finally, not to speak of the many *Briefs* and *Allocutions* on a great variety of interesting questions, there are his official "*Letters*" to the Bishops of Brazil, "denouncing the infamous slave trade" (May 5, 1888); to the Bishops of Sicily, containing "a defence of the policy of the Popes in the twelfth century" (April 12, 1882); to Cardinal Rampolla, declaring "his views on the government of the whole Church" (June, 15, 1887); and, omitting many others, there is a *Letter*, written to the Bishops of the Provinces of Milan, Turin and Vercelli (Jan. 25, 1882), on the duties of newspaper men.

Some of our American editors, and especially "reporters," might gather a few useful lessons from the perusal of this "*Epistola.*" Here are some of its words:

"The fearless and open love of truth is indeed beautiful. But let writers be mindful of their duty to abstain from every expression which might, with reason, give offense to an upright man, and never forget the use of that prudence and moderation which must accompany every virtue. No intelligent man will ever approve either the useless bitterness of their style, or their levity in giving publicity to unfounded suspicions, or to what, in general, is lacking in the respect due to all."

The Apostle Peter, to whom Christ, the divine founder of the Church, "gave the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt.,.16) and whom he appointed to be His Vicar "to feed His lambs and His sheep" (John, 21) still lives in his successors, the sovereign Pontiffs, the Bishops of Rome. To each and every one of them, as represented in the person of St. Peter, Christ has said: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," and "Do thou confirm thy brethren" (Luke, 22). Hence Peter's voice has never been silent. As it spoke of old by the mouth of Linus and of Clement, of Leo and Gregory the Great, so, in these our days, has it spoken to the Catholic Church against which "the gates of hell shall never prevail," by the mouth of Pius IX. and of the reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII.

S. M. BRANDI, S. J.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG MEN IN JAMAICA.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, SIR HENRY A. BLAKE, GOVERNOR OF JAMAICA.

THE Jamaica International Exhibition which was opened by H. R. H. Prince George of Wales in January, 1891, and remained open until May, resulted in the influx of a considerable number of observing visitors, and the dissemination of a large amount of information, through the English and American press, as to the island, its beauties, its progress and its capabilities. The interest aroused on both sides of the Atlantic has been shown by numerous letters received by me and by others in the colony asking for further information, especially as to the prospects of success for young men desirous of trying their fortune amid the beautiful surroundings so often described, but whose infinite variety baffles the power of words to fully paint.

These inquirers resolve themselves into two divisions—those who have capital and those who have none. To the latter I have always replied that there is no opening for them. The inquirer with capital I have advised to come to Jamaica, and to spend at least twelve months in examining the different parts of the island before investing his money. If he can get temporary employment on an "estate" or on a "pen," so much the better. He will learn how to deal with the people, and also find out if the climate suits him for practical work. It must be remembered that visiting a tropical country is very different to working in it, even though the work be simply supervision. If he is satisfied, he can then choose whether he will invest in the purchase of a "pen," and become a breeder of cattle, horses or mules, or all three ; or whether he will purchase an "estate," that is, a property on which the business is the cultivation of sugar, coffee, fruit or fibre.

As to the kind of crops that can be produced in Jamaica, if we leave out the cereals, wheat, barley, and oats, the island will produce anything that can be grown in the North American continent. Its soil, elevation, and climate are so diversified that while sugar-cane and pine-apples are growing in the plains, English gorse is in bloom in the high hills, and wild strawberries abound on all the mountain paths.

It is not my intention to go into particulars of the various crops that now form the staple exports of Jamaica. Suffice it to say that they pay the growers well, when the profits are not swallowed up in the expenses attending the management of properties belonging to absentees. The average cost of management and commissions on such properties is about 20 per cent., at least one-half of which could be saved to a resident and industrious owner. But the crops may be divided into two broad divisions, those that pay best when grown extensively, and those suitable for small proprietors, of whom over fifty thousand are to be found in Jamaica. In the former category we will have sugar, bananas, coffee, cacao, oranges, tobacco; and in the near future I hope to see the cultivation of the *agave rigida*, or sisal-hemp plant, extend. Small growers can profitably produce ginger, nutmegs, maize, tomatoes, yams, onions, potatoes and other vegetables suitable for the Canadian or American markets.

Grapes grow as freely as in California, and only require careful cultivation to yield very large returns. All these crops are capable of enormous expansion, but the carelessness of our people prevents their growing them with as much profit as might be made. The Jamaica oranges are the best in the world; there is no systematic care taken of their growing, picking, sizing and packing, as there is in Florida. So far there has been no attempt to grow separately the different kinds of banana, although the trade has expanded in ten years from the export value of £44,215 to £531,726.

There are large cocoanut walks in the island. The nuts are sold for about three-fifths of the price given for Baracoa nuts. No care is taken, as in Mauritius and elsewhere, to thin the branches as grapes are thinned, and thus give room for the nuts to grow. Everything is left to nature, and so bounteous is she that she yields with lavish hand, paying returns in defiance of a system that violates every canon of successful agriculture.

But, it may well be asked, if there are all these opportunities for the investment of capital, how comes it that while young Englishmen flock to Manitoba or Nebraska, the Cape, New Zealand, or Australia, undeterred by distance or climate, and ready to begin a hard struggle by building a log hut, they neglect the island of Jamaica, in which they may find houses ready built, fences ready made, and fields that only require the ordinary annual operation for putting in the crop ? and, further, how is it that the owners of these valuable properties are so ready to part with them for a small consideration ?

The answer is simple. When the work of a slave, with interest upon his value, could be had for about fifteen pounds a year, and when sugar sold at sixty pounds per ton, it paid for the reckless extravagance of the vicious and riotous living of many of the local managers and owners. It paid for the appalling waste of human life. Cargoes of young men came out year after year, and were plunged into a fiery furnace of temptation that only a moral hero could withstand. By scores and hundreds the yellow fever claimed them, and if men lived now as they lived then it may be assumed that yellow fever would become a perennial scourge. But the absentee owner in England drew a princely income and asked no questions. With falling markets incomes fell, and the manumission of the slaves accelerated the downward movement. Some managers refused to accept the dictum that emancipation involved the right to abstain from labor. They could not realize that to a slave whose life had been one long weary round of coerced labor relaxation from work must have been the greatest happiness, and they drove from the estates the people who, from the first ecstasy of freedom, refused to give for a daily wage the same steady labor they had erstwhile yielded to the persuasion of the cowhide. Others claimed exorbitant rents for the mud hovels in which the now free laborers resided. Six shillings and eightpence per week for each inmate over ten years of age was* a not uncommon claim made for the rent of hovels, the erection of which had not originally cost a pound. The consequences might have been easily foretold by people less stupidly blind. Already great numbers of negroes had cleared patches in the unclaimed forests that clothed the hills. The people thus

* "Letter to the Marquis of Normanby relative to the state of Jamaica, by the Marquis of Sligo," 1839.

driven off joined their friends in the interior and there laid the foundation for the peasant proprietary that is now so marked a feature in the social economy of Jamaica.

It was not long before the income of the absentee owner approached the vanishing point, and at length calls for remittances from him to enable his agent to square accounts were not uncommon. Then in some cases properties were abandoned; in others they were sold for nominal sums to the local manager or overseer; and many have been kept on, just managing to pay a very small sum to the owner, the returns being absorbed in the payment of local supervision and charges.

All this took place during the past generation. It is only fifty years since steam communication between England and Jamaica was established, and not one proprietor in a hundred thought it worth his while to make the voyage. The belief was accepted that property in Jamaica was valueless, and the memory of the young men who had died on the sugar estates in endless succession, and the recurring epidemics of yellow fever among the white troops, who were fed and clothed and overcrowded with all the ignorant brutality of our military system of fifty years ago, stamped the island in the opinion of the English people as a white man's grave, to be carefully avoided. Hitherto no special means have been taken to dispel these illusions. Now, that soldiers are treated on more rational principles, the reports of the army medical officers show that Jamaica is almost the healthiest station for the British troops out of the United Kingdom, while the general health of the community is shown by the vital statistics, which give the average death rate per thousand for the past seven years as 23.9, a very low rate when it is remembered that the death rate of black children under five is abnormally high.

But old beliefs die hard, and years after the extraordinary beauties of Jamaica had been described and its capabilities demonstrated by visitors who had braved the climatic superstition and found here renewed health and strength, properties were being sold for less than the value of the stock that was on them, or in some cases for a tenth of the value of the logwood that grew upon them.

A "pen" is usually divided into guinea-grass, common pasture and "wood and ruinate." The average value would be four pounds for guinea-grass per acre, two pounds for common

pasture and one pound for "wood and ruinate." It is not possible to give an average value for estates for crop cultivation, as everything depends upon position, soil, and water capabilities. At present mules are the best-paying stock. A three-year-old mule can be bred for seven and eight pounds. The average selling price is about seventeen pounds.

As to estates for the cultivation of crops, granting the proper condition of climate and soil, the yield will depend upon the industry and ability of the manager. In the cultivation of crops there are so many possible leakages that the fool and his money soon part.

But, besides the cultivation of the land, there are other ways of making money. The exhibition has shown that Jamaica has a large quantity of ochres that if treated on the spot would pay a fair dividend. The island also possesses pottery clay as good as any in England. The difficulty is that of obtaining skilled labor. A local company started a pottery, and trained workmen were imported from England. But English tradesmen seem unable to resist the seductions of cheap rum in the tropics. The two leading hands spent their time between the lock-up and the gutters; the terra-cotta works are suspended, and the problem of reliable skilled labor that will last long enough to teach our own more sober people is still to be solved.

I find that I have not said anything upon an important factor —labor. To the question as to the abundance of labor, there will be as many answers as there are differences of disposition of employers. To secure a fair day's work the eye of the master is necessary, but I am satisfied that there is no necessity for apprehension on the score of labor.

I have put aside all temptations to embark in description of the beauties of Jamaica, and confined myself to a slight sketch of some of its capabilities; so that young men may realize that here, within a three days' sea-journey from the United States, there is a British island where money can be made, where the climate is healthy, and where life and property are as secure as on any portion of the American continent.

It is necessary to emphasize the fact that the people are singularly law-abiding, and that there is an entire absence of the reported crimes that, if true, disgrace the Southern States of America, for there is a tendency of many writers to jump to

general conclusions as to the negroes, from limited observations. I find the following passage in a book by Philip A. Bruce on "The Plantation Negro as a Freeman," published in New York. Having spoken of the reverting of the Haytian negro to African tribal customs, he says:

"Jamaica has sunk to an equally hopeless condition. One of the fairest parts of the globe, a part upon which nature has lavished without stint her greatest treasures and beauties, has declined to a tropical wilderness far more wretched, with its evidence of former prosperity, than when the foot of Columbus first touched the shores of San Salvador."

Now I can only say that this is ridiculously untrue. The aggregate amount of land in cultivation has been steadily increasing since the date of emancipation, and is still increasing. In 1870 there were 1,832,386 acres in cultivation. In 1890 there were 1,896,290, and, while there is still ample room for improvement there is much reason for satisfaction with the social advance of the people. They are fulfilling their duties as citizens quietly and well, and there are no grounds for apprehension that they will retrograde from their present position. Jamaica, beautiful, healthy, and fertile, with a law-abiding population, and a good supply of labor, offers opportunities for investment that only require to be known to secure an influx of industrious capitalists whose advent must accelerate her material progress.

HENRY A. BLAKE.

THE HORSE IN AMERICA.

BY COLONEL THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

ALTHOUGH the earliest known remains of the ancestor of the horse are found in New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah, there were, despite favorable conditions, no horses to be found in the Americas at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards. That the climate and other circumstances were well fitted for their development was abundantly proven by their rapid increase from the few individuals abandoned by or fugitive from the Spanish troops about the middle of the sixteenth century. This is a curious but not an isolated instance of such a failure in the equine race. The original horse of northern Europe is thought to have died out; he was at least entirely supplanted by better specimens brought by man from Africa and the East.

The Spaniards had long used for war the light, handsome Moorish horse, and no doubt it was the Barb which came with them to America. The big Flanders or Norman mount, which alone could carry the knight in full armor, had been driven out, together with that wretched bully, his master, by the constantly extending use of fire-arms. The Barb was of the same race which is largely represented in the English thoroughbred, and upon the latter all civilized nations now rely to improve their stock. The beginning of the thoroughbred was in the native English racing mares, coming of mixed Spanish and English strains, the former being descendants of the Barbs, and both being impressed by the Arabian blood imported by the Stuarts. Thus by the earliest and by subsequent importation the horse of the Moors has become strongly represented in America, both in its wild and civilized states.

It is not probable that the grade of animal brought over from Spain three hundred and fifty years ago was high; but the climate of South and Central America was well suited to the creature

whose original habitat was the sand of the desert, and it needed but a short space for large herds of wild horses to spring into being. These herds did not, however, very rapidly work their way north. It is always by man that the horse gets transplanted into colder climes. The Indians discovered his availability, and gradually domesticated him on our Western plains. There was no attempt among them to improve the breed ; but the grass the ponies fed on was nutritious ; the distance they had to travel to get their daily supply made them stayers ; the frequent call to escape from wolves made them fleet ; and their exposure made them hardy. These qualities have remained with the plains horse in ample measure. Many a pony has been lassoed and ridden a hundred miles on a stretch.

Colder latitudes are apt to stunt the wild horse. In Mexico it throve better, and there, to-day, many points of the Barb, particularly the oval face and teacup muzzle, may be distinctly recognized. For the rest, however, the pony has everywhere lost the beautiful lines of his ancestor. The noble crest and fine throttle, the round barrel well coupled to the quarters, the tail high set on, are no longer present. Grass has distended the belly for many generations, and has permanently injured the middle-piece and coupling in structure and looks, if not in usefulness. But the legs are as fine as a stag's, and in those points which make for service and not for show he ranks well. No amount of exposure or abuse will kill him, while his intelligence is marked.

Many of the ponies of the Canadian Indians do not come from the plains, but are offshoots of the civilized horse dwarfed by generations of exposure ; and near civilization there is always some admixture of the plains with the domestic animal. But the horse of the plains remains a distinct creature. He is not the one which interests us at the moment. He has nothing to do with the horse of the Atlantic or Middle States, or, as he is called out among the cow-boys, the "American" horse.

Columbus, on his second voyage, in 1493, is known to have brought over a few horses. Cabeca de Vaca brought forty-two to Florida in 1527. But these all died out. De Soto's horses, abandoned on the Mississippi, bred on the plains and were lost to civilization. In 1625 Flemish horses were brought to New York ; but the better blood later imported has gradually eliminated the Flanders character, unless it has survived in what used to be

known as the Conestoga draught-horse. In 1629 horses were brought to the colony of Massachusetts Bay. Judging from their progeny, they were in all probability Cleveland bays and dray-horses.

The Canadian horse is a descendant of the Norman, imported shortly after 1600. The Norman is himself of a pure race (*i. e.*, one able to continue propagation in his own specific form), and possesses beauty of shape, great bulk, good endurance, and fine feet and legs. His docility has remained with him in his new home; he has kept most of his good qualities, lost bulk, and gained capacity for speed. The horse of the Eastern States exhibits traces of no particular race. While the richer planters of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas, as well as the wealthy classes of New York and New Jersey, were able to import many and stanch thoroughbreds, the poor farmers of New England were fain to be content with the average specimens which they continued to bring over from time to time. Lack of blood and system in raising produced a haphazard breed of horses. These were distinctly useful for their purpose, remained sound in legs and feet on account of the dirt roads, and were good-tempered and able. But though the American was a good "all-round" horse, he did not improve without further infusion of blood. The South has always had a large proportion of thorough blood. There is a list of some three hundred thoroughbreds—horses carried on the Stud Book—imported from England from 1729 to 1840, and these went largely to the Southern States.

The good horse of the South shows more decided marks of thorough blood than his equal in the North. The common horse of the South is a weed; in the North he has substance. The draught-animal of the South is the mule, as it is oxen which do the very heavy work in the eastern country districts. As a rule, the western horses have come from the same sections as the population of the several Western States. Upon the breeds carried beyond the Alleghanies from the Eastern States there has been more or less impress made by imported thorough blood. Some heavy stock has been imported from France and elsewhere for the improvement, for draught purposes, of the native horses. But the cis-Mississippi horse has had his origin universally in the Atlantic States.

The trotting horse of the North, though great speed was originally due to thoroughbred Messenger, has drawn more largely on common strains than the racer of the South, and in the Eastern States the saddle-horse has never been cultivated as it always has been in those States where bad roads restrict wheeled locomotion. Where snow lay three months in the year, and roads were better cared for, the saddle-beast was not a *sine quâ non*, and until fashion has again brought riding to the fore there has been nothing worthy the name since the extinction of the Narragansett pacer. The form and capability of the horse always follow the demand. In the North this demand has been for a roadster; in the South for a saddle-beast. In each section the horse has responded to the call in qualities peculiarly suited to either duty.

Probably more and better horses are owned in America per thousand of population than in any other country, and the farmer or corner-groceryman, at least in the North and West, can and does afford to keep as good a roadster as the city nabob,—often a better one. While the average horse lacks the distinctive characteristics of race, he has exceptionally good qualities. American horses are, as a rule, sure-footed. There are more broken-kneed nags in cabs and livery-stables in England four-fold than here. Smooth roads and level meadows uniformly breed horses less careful how they tread than rough roads and stony pastures. The eastern granite soil produces safer steppers than the clay of the South. Our horses are of even disposition; one rarely sees a brute or a biting, striking, kicking devil in America. They are easily broken. In Kentucky the children ride the colts, often with only a stick to guide them. "I consider," said Herbert long ago, "the general horse of America superior, not in blood or in beauty, but decidedly in hardihood to do and to endure, in powers of travel, in speed, in docility, and in good temper, to any other race of general horses in the known world."

Except perhaps in the matter of trotting, the main distinction between the horse in England—as typical of Europe (for all Europe now is imitating England in matters equine)—and the horse in America has lain in the lack of system in breeding. Of very late years there has been considerable attention paid in this country to breeding, and the admixture of different bloods, which has produced "nondescripts with which America is overrun," is

being avoided. That breeds have been kept separate in England is due to the fact that the raising of horses has largely been in the hands of great land-owners or capitalists, and the farmers who raised horses had their intelligence as well as their stud to profit by; whereas in America, until of recent years, breeding of all but thoroughbreds was, with few exceptions, an entirely random affair. A farmer had a stanch mare. The only available stallion was in the neighboring village—perhaps on circuit. All he could see was that there were good qualities present in both, and he believed that these would be transmitted. Race was never dreamed of. Often the mare was not bred from until she was unfitted for work by something which equally unfitted her for breeding. No doubt the average produce of this lack of method may have been of excellent service in its way, but it was none the less "nondescript."

In England the thoroughbred or racer, the hunter, the hackney, the cob, the galloway, the Shetland, the carriage-horse, the gigster, the Suffolk Punch, Clydesdale, and other cart-horses, the Cleveland bays and black Hanoverians, have all been kept distinct, and are regularly bred. One of the first things a horseman is struck with is the crisp distinction between the several varieties, in shape, qualities, and performance. In earlier days, in America, beside the imported thoroughbreds, a strain of which has always been kept pure, there were the Canadian Norman, the Narragansett pacer, the Vermont and the Conestoga draught-horses, somewhat later the Morgan, the saddle-horse of the South, and no doubt other more or less distinctive varieties. But these gradually became intermixed, and lost their several characteristics. All horses grew to look more or less alike. Within a generation greater care has again begun to be exercised to produce horses especially adapted to certain classes of work. Capital is put back of horse-breeding, and the results are already noticeable.

Much has been written about and claimed for the Morgan horse. By many he has been thought to be a product of the Canadian Norman. But it is probable that Justin Morgan, the founder of the breed, was of excellent, if not thorough, English blood. Few horses have been able to transmit their form and qualities as did this remarkable little animal; and these were of the best as regards beauty, intelligence, speed, and endurance. Though lacking size and "quality," Justin Morgan seemed to

possess all the virtues associated with the latter element. The Morgans have all but run out to-day, but there have been some deserving attempts to revive the breed, and for certain work they were unsurpassed.

The special product of American horse-sense is the trotter. So wonderful has been the result of our endeavors to produce a fast trotting horse that in true national style we have distanced the universe. We can easily place all the trotting horses of the world, as Colonel O'Kelly did Eclipse—"the American trotter first, the rest nowhere." The Orloff trotters brought over here from Russia a few years since, though handsome and apparently of great endurance, were so lacking in speed that racing with them became a farce. Not one of them could show a thirty-clip. To our dirt roads is partly due the speed of our driving-horses. A European turnpike would speedily use up a fast nag's legs and feet. Dirt roads are apt to continue in the country, and near cities there will always be a speeding-ground provided so long as we drive fast horses. Trickery on trotting-tracks has somewhat robbed this sport of its good repute, and Anglomania, seasoning the better breeding of the thoroughbred, has called up running as the fashionable pastime. But whoso has owned and regularly driven for pleasure a pair of fine trotters or roadsters to the typical American light rig, cannot fail to hope that the promised regeneration of the trotting-track, with all its collateral usefulness, may not be long delayed. The American roadster has no equal.

From the day, seventy years ago, when intelligent men laid their money against Boston Blue, who was matched to trot a mile inside of the then incredible time of three minutes, to the present year of grace, when the list of horses who have beaten 2:20 numbers many score, and the best trotting time is within less than half a minute of the best running speed, there has been such a marvellous advance in this problem, as well as in its corollary, fast road-horses, that it is doubtful whether there exists in the history of the horse, in any part of the world, its parallel. It took more than two centuries for the English thoroughbred to score a marked gain over his ancestor, the Arab. In a quarter of a century the trotter has made decidedly more marked progress in swiftness. The very anatomy of the animal has been changed by breeding. He is no longer what the original trotter was, but

a fine thoroughbred creature, with as many of the points of speed and wind as the greyhound. He has, in fact, been bred too fine. He has lost his weight-pulling capacity. It is a curious fact that while the running thoroughbred has, since 1750, gained at least three inches in height, if not a full hand, the trotting horse, in some forty years, has lost in size and weight perhaps half as much. The average of the speedy horses on the track are not capable of pulling a heavy Goddard buggy in good style, let alone a carry-all and four people, or a trap built on English ideas. Our track sulkies have got down to forty pounds and our road wagons to a hundred and twenty, which equalizes the matter somewhat, but this decrease in size is to be regretted, and is, to judge from the racer, by no means a necessary sequence of trotting speed.

But the endurance of the trotting-horse is as remarkable as his speed. Perhaps there is nothing in the annals of the horse superior to Trustee, Lady Fulton, John Stewart, and Captain MacGown trotting twenty miles inside one hour; Ariel, Black Joke, and Spangle, fifty miles in less than four; Conqueror, one hundred miles short of nine hours; and Fanny Jenks, one hundred and one in nine and three-quarters. Fanny Murray and Kate are also on record as having done their hundred miles in nine and three-quarter hours. And the habit of trotting heats, best three in five, instead of dashes, proves the ability to repeat of the American stock. The exertion called for by a mile trotted in 2:10 is quite as great as that by a mile run in 1:40.

In America we are going in the direction which speed always points out, and training and racing mere colts. The temptation to realize at an early age is, of course, great with breeders; but to see yearlings running and trotting in public races calls up a serious question. Two-year-olds and even yearlings have trotted at a speed which, forty years ago, was deemed impossible at any age. Yearlings have trotted quarters in thirty-eight seconds. It is claimed by breeders that this is natural speed; that the colts are not unduly trained or pushed, and that these trials are necessary to ascertain what colts have in them, and thus weed out those which will not pay to keep an extra year. But to produce a twenty-miler, or a horse which is sound and serviceable at twenty years, one would scarcely go to work after this fashion.

There is, perhaps, no establishment more typically American than Governor Leland Stanford's breeding-farm for trotters at

Palo Alto, California. It has no equal anywhere. The entire ranch covers some eighty-five hundred acres, and it is here that the university is to be located. There were in April, 1891, in stables, paddocks, and pasture some eleven hundred colts and horses, counting yearlings being broken to harness, and weanlings daily exercised on the "kindergarten" track. This latter is a small oval enclosure, perhaps three hundred yards in circumference, around which the colts are daily exercised, a number at a time, under instruction of a trainer, who stands in the centre with a whip. The colts are allowed only to trot. If one breaks, all are stopped and started again. Here the colts gain strength, knowledge of what is required of them, and steadiness. Everything on the ranch is of the best, from blood down, and the system of reasonable treatment is enforced on a large scale. In the paddock a colt may "fool" to the top of his bent; but the instant a man approaches him he is taught that he will be kindly treated and that he must act in a business-like way. Teasing or playing with a colt, other than "gentling" him, is prohibited. So far from a groom being allowed to strike a horse, not even an ill-tempered word, much less an oath, is permitted. The result is apparent in the uniform tractability of the colts, or, in other words, their serviceability and value. They need no "breaking," as usually understood. As yearlings they are already well trained, and have such confidence in their attendants that most of them can be harnessed and driven without difficulty.

The running horse has always been the special pet of the Southerner, who has never taken kindly to trotting. Up to the fifties many of the very best racers came from the Northern States. None came from the East, for the camp-meeting Puritan would not countenance racing—though, indeed, it may be asserted that racing has done more for the good of the community by improving the horse than camp-meetings have ever done for religion by improving man. And many were the notable contests on the track, where dollars by the hundreds of thousands changed hands, which antedated the war. But the less amicable interchanges of civil strife drove horse-racing from the minds of every one and transplanted all but the choicest horses, and, indeed, many of these, from training-stables to cavalry barracks.

In the palmy days Northern racers fully held their own. Black Maria, than whom no stancher ever stood on four pas-

terns, was a Jersey mare; so was Fashion, by long odds the best racer of her day; Eclipse was raised on Long Island. What finer trio can be named? But the sport was more general in the South; and up to the outbreak of the war Virginia, followed by Kentucky, gained more extensive, if not better, results in runners, as their race meetings were more frequent and rivalry was stronger. A warm climate is generally most favorable to the thoroughbred. The blue-grass region is his paradise. Here, on the lower Silurian limestone, all mammals thrive. Men and women are of noticeable size and beauty. Cattle are huge. A paddock full of yearling colts or fillies gives you the impression of a lot of two-year-olds. The weight and height of the blue-grass thoroughbred average considerably more than elsewhere—unless in California.

The relative speed and stoutness of the thoroughbred and the Oriental horse have been settled long ago. Two hundred years since, the fastest runners in the world were no doubt the Arabians. These are presumably to-day much what they then were, while their English progeny has vastly improved. This is due to more intelligent breeding and to tests on the race-course affording better selection of the fittest animals to breed from. Even with an allowance of as high as forty-eight pounds, the Arab has never been able to win an English race, while in Egypt, in the fifties, Fair Nell, who, though very well bred, was not proven thoroughbred, defeated all the best Barbs of Ali Pacha with ease, at all distances, on their own ground and on their own terms. It is clear beyond a peradventure that the thoroughbred possesses speed and endurance (or, more properly, *endurance at speed*, for such is his peculiar inheritance) beyond any other horse, as he has greater beauty. His feats of gameness and pace are unmatched. To rehearse some of the old performances is worth while. Bay Bolton, at York, in 1710, ran four miles in 7 minutes 43 seconds; Eclipse, at Winchester, in 1769, in 8 minutes; Lady Elizabeth, at Doncaster, in 1833, in 7 minutes 46 seconds; Stockwell, at Newmarket, in 1854, in 7 minutes 29 seconds; Lexington, at New Orleans, in 1855, in 7 minutes 19¾ seconds; Ten Broeck, at Louisville, in 1876, in 7 minutes 16 seconds; while Black Maria, on Long Island, in 1832, ran her fifth four-mile heat in 8 minutes 47 seconds,—the whole twenty miles in 41 minutes 40 seconds! Not only do

statistics show that the thoroughbred is superior to his ancestor, but that he is gradually improving on himself; and this present process of improvement, due exclusively to the rivalry of the turf, explains how he has gained on his Arabian cousins, who have substantially stood still for centuries.

Another comparison may be instituted between the marvellous performances which are related of ponies on the plains and the well-known records of thoroughbreds. That the latter are invariably proven, and the former rarely so, does not militate against the really remarkable feats of the bronco. But the allegation often made that the mustang can go further than the civilized horse, let alone the thoroughbred, is very wide of the truth. It is doubtful whether any wild horse ever equalled the record of the little pony which beat the mail from London to Exeter, one hundred and seventy-two miles, in twenty-three and a half hours, or of the galloway who ran three hundred miles at Newmarket in 1754 in sixty-four hours and twenty minutes; while it can safely be claimed that no wild horse ever went one hundred miles in nine or ten hours. And one thing is especially to be noted: we not only have no "record" of time and distance, but we never learn whether the great feat quoted killed the bronco; whereas the feat of the thoroughbred, to be of value, must be accomplished without material injury. Any game thoroughbred ridden until he stops will fall dead. Not so the bronco. But the latter may be ruined, and one hears of the performance, not its results. It is very rare that the great performances of thoroughbreds permanently injure them.

The comparative stoutness and speed of English and American thoroughbreds is not a fruitful topic. The matter is so evenly balanced that the different methods of running, weighting, and timing horses produce statistics out of which one can prove arithmetically anything, actually nothing. In order to pronounce definite judgment between breeds or races of horses, there must be a perceptible difference. Between the thoroughbred of England and America the advantage is imperceptible. English turf records have been authoritative only since the St. Leger, Oaks, and Derby were established, a trifle over one hundred years ago. Those of the American turf are more recent. But excellent and perfectly reliable records were published in *The American Farmer* from 1818 to 1830, since when official

records have been kept. But from the records no superiority can be shown.

Though the odds of percentage, climate, and accident are all against success in sending American horses over to compete on the English turf, we have no reason to be ashamed of our performances and trophies, from the days of stanch Prioress to Iroquois, winner of the Derby. A time-test will not serve. In America we race from start to finish. Many an English cup has been won where the stanchest horses have not extended themselves over a distance. But, judging from all facts, while there is perhaps no valid ground for asserting that the American thoroughbred is a better stayer than the English, or more speedy, it can be maintained with certainty that he does not fall behind him in any sense. On time-tests alone the American stands higher. It is to be regretted that friendly rivalry has not brought Englishmen over here with their studs as it has with their yachts, and that it is only Americans who have crossed the ocean to test their horses. This, however, is natural enough, for the home of the turf is the mother-country.

It is probable that the average of English breeding is more careful; until lately it certainly has been, and it has extended over a longer period than our own. It is also probable that the English trainers are more expert, certainly on their own soil, than ours, at least so far as preparing for mere speed and game is concerned. But a thoroughbred from a racing-stable rarely has manners. It is scarcely doubtful that the higher class of English jockeys are the more expert. America has produced no Archer. It is not intended to refer to the average of English jockeys. Many of these men who can find no occupation at home drift over here, and are in the same category with the majority of the English grooms in American cities. But the jockeys who rise high in their profession in the larger field afforded by the English turf are artists, probably superior to any we have produced.

As fox-hunting is in America only an exotic, so we have no equivalent of the English hunter, a creature bred for his particular work, and no doubt at his best the most perfect of horses —bar none. Many of our well-bred horses turn out superb timber-jumpers; many are up to weight; but this alone does not insure success after hounds. There is too little variety in the obstacles of our country to make clever hunters. As a rule,

thoroughbreds are flyers rather than high jumpers. Many of our horses have proven to be flyers, jumpers, and stayers under very severe tests. In leaping-contests we have done wonders. There has been no parallel to the high jumping at horse shows here and in Canada during the past few years. A number of horses have cleared six feet six of timber, while the abnormal height of seven feet has been cleared by one, if not more. These are not guess-work measurements, but accurately levelled, and the jumps have usually been made by artificial light and in cold blood. There are some traditional jumps in England, but no records equalling this. Still, mere high jumping by no means makes a hunter. These same horses were no better than many others after hounds. It will take years of cross-country riding in America to make either horse or man equal to the best English model. Our climate is neither suitable to the sport—hunting over snow scarcely sounds attractive—nor is the country such as to make it what it is in its true home in the midland counties. Too few men call for hunters here for us to expect to find the bone, courage, manners, cleverness, or strength of the English hunter, which is, without question, the animal best adapted to any and every use—except mere draught—to which a horse can be put. There is no work off the track for which he is not fit and which he is not able to do better than any other horse.

But we have none the less created in many sections of America a basis of very good sport. The obstacles are, as a rule, stone walls in Massachusetts; in New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, timber; in Canada, both. Hedges and water are rare. The stone walls are not high; the timber very stiff, but cleaner jumping. Probably no county in England affords such high timber-jumping as some localities regularly hunted here. Where the pace is not severe, the coarse horses do as good jumping as the thoroughbreds; trotting-stock produces fine jumpers; but in hunts where the pace is forced blood must be had. Hunting men here now ride American horses almost exclusively. Even the high-priced English and Irish horses, many of which have been imported, have done less well over our timber, and many have failed utterly. It seems to be the prevailing opinion that they showed endurance, but less jumping power than the American-bred horses, which, on the other hand, cost but a third of the

money. Perhaps more good hunters come from the vicinity of Geneseo, N. Y., where is one of the oldest hunts in America, and from Canada, than from any other places at the present moment. Part of the thorough blood in this particular hunting-stock came from the South during or after the war. But (and this is a big word) there is in most places a plentiful lack of foxes. Our perseverance in hunting drags is certainly commendable. In Geneseo, Reynard has been longer cultivated and is more at home, and the drag is less essential. *Fox*-hunting there is common; elsewhere exceptional.

While saying everything in favor of English racing methods, and excepting always English hunting (for in this finest of all sports our British cousin is alone and incomparable), there is no doubt whatever that America furnishes the best saddle-horses. The type of hunter is so indelibly stamped on the Englishman's soul that his road-horse partakes too much of a similar character. In our Northern cities unreasoning imitation of the English type brings about the same result; in Canada a more natural process of imitation does the like; and riders, in their demand for a horse that can "gallop and jump," forget that south of Mason and Dixon's line—if there still be such an antiquated landmark—there are everywhere better saddle-beasts than any part of England can boast of to-day. Since the *manége* has been discarded from the old country, with lace ruffles and buckled shoes, the pendulum has swung too far away from the niceties of the saddle, and much that is admirable has been lost. The Briton recognizes but two gaits on the road—the trot and canter. The latter is uniformly *taboo* among men, and he is thus reduced to a simple trot. Our fashionables follow suit. Now, there is no more exhilarating, nobler gait than a square, open, sharp, elastic trot; nor, indeed, is there a better every-day wine than sherry. But to do nothing but trot on the road is on a par with a man's drinking nothing but sherry and discarding every other wine because sherry is good enough.

In the South it is usual to train horses to special gaits. Any horse can possess several distinct and well-settled gaits if a man will study to keep him pure in their performance. He may "walk," Southern style, or rack, five to eight miles an hour, single-foot up to twelve, trot from six to fifteen, and "canter all day in the shade of an apple-tree," or at a twelve-mile gait, at will. No

man gallops on the road. The climate of the South naturally leads riders to prefer the easier gaits. But these are entirely consistent with an admirable trot if the rider desires it. And it is undeniable that the Southern thoroughbred saddle-horse is by long odds a finer mount than anything which mere imitation of English style can produce in our Northern cities. This is no place to discuss riders. But the fact is undeniable that we have at home the *perfect saddle-beast*, and that our Anglomaniacs will not use him. When one is brought east (and many are), he is at once despoiled of his fine gaits and delicate training, taught to lug on the bit, and allowed only to trot, or on rare occasions to break into a gallop. Let us hope that time will cure this. To the English we of the North are indebted for very much in athletics; especially for the new and capital habit of saddle-work. Let us look about us for the best means of keeping it up, and not despise what we have at home. Our own stock furnishes our best hunters. Let us stick to our own saddle-beasts as well, and learn from the Southerner what is best in his equitation, as shown us in the saddle-horses he can send us.

This superiority was well shown during the war in the cavalry service of North and South. For fully two years our cavalry could not compare with that of the South. Not only were our men poor riders, but the horses were not broken to saddle, and between them, as a rule, we made a sorry mess of it. But by-and-by we learned; good leaders came to the fore; our supply of animals lasted longer, and our cavalry became more than a match for the enemy. Old troopers will remember with pleasure the splendid mounts of "raider" stock which were occasionally picked up in Virginia, and how superior they were to the horse supposed to be quite fit for mounted service because he had "U. S." branded on his shoulder.

The Southern saddle-horse is of a distinct breed, having a marked strain of thorough blood. He may have originated in the Narragansett pacer. Some of these horses are known to have drifted to Tennessee. In Kentucky they speak of the thoroughbred racer, the thoroughbred trotter, and the thoroughbred saddle-horse. The first alone is of strictly thorough blood. The shape, gaits, and action of each are absolutely distinct. The racer and trotter we are familiar with. The saddle-horse has a much shorter, crisper, quicker gait. He does not extend him-

self. He is bred for the rider's comfort ; and while he will gallop with a fine, open stride, and jump well, his peculiar value lies in the heritage of what we in the North call artificial gaits, but what to the Southerner, who rides fifty miles to our one, are the natural gaits. These rackers, or running walkers, can cover from six to eight miles an hour with such absolute freedom from motion to the riders that the feat is often performed of carrying a glass flush-full with water a mile or more in the saddle without spilling a drop. In the heat of summer this ease is essential where the saddle takes the place of wheels, and the gait is an exquisite one at all times. The horse does not tire on these gaits, though there is a general impression in States where these animals are not inbred that rackers or "walkers" cannot go a distance. In the South they go every day and all day. This suffices.

There is no special type of carriage-horse in America, but high prices are paid in the cities for handsome teams, and not even in the Bois de Boulogne can one count more superb matched pairs than are seen turning into Central Park on a fine afternoon in the season. So far we have avoided the ponderous family coach in which the dowager duchess takes her airing along the Serpentine ; nor are the equally ponderous horses known ; nor, indeed, the elaborate and heavy harnesses which cover many a straight shoulder and weak quarter. But for up-headed, high-stepping, speedy matched pairs from fifteen and a half to seventeen hands in height, which show quality in every point, our metropolitan cities have no superiors. We have found it of advantage to import English coachmen to teach us "style," as the best of them have really done ; but the material was here ready to hand, and the means are poured out with lavish hand.

Perhaps the old-time coaching was as good a test of driving-horses as can be found. The annals of English coaching are well known. The testimony of Mr. Herbert, above quoted,—and he is a good witness, being an Englishman and one of the very best horsemen of his day,—is to the effect that, taking roads into consideration, the style of work which used to be done on the post-coaches in New England and New York, principally by Vermont horses, has never been approached elsewhere. This opinion was given from an almost unequalled experience, during the prime years of coaching, between 1825 and 1831, on all the flying-roads of the day in England. And he, moreover, adds that these Ver-

mont mares are incomparably the likeliest from which, by a well-chosen thoroughbred sire, to raise the most magnificent carriage-horses in the world.

We have in America no equivalent of the big brewer's dray-horse of England, nor, indeed, use for him. The exceptional specimen of this overgrown animal is kept for purposes of show rather than utility. The average one is slow and unable to do anything like the proportionate work of a lighter horse. Of late years sufficiently large animals have been bred for heavy city teaming from stock imported into the Middle and Western States. They lack somewhat the flesh of the English horse, but are able, speedier, and more enduring. For lighter and quicker draught work, such as is especially called for by our express companies, probably there exists no better animal than the Eastern horse or than many of the horses now bred for such purposes in the West, not infrequently a cross of the imported Percheron with native stock. For a certain class of heavy work there is no such horse in the world as the Percheron. The omnibuses of Paris and the diligences all over France are drawn by these powerful animals, and at a good, if not rapid, gait. Within their limits they are not equalled. We have nothing nearer the Percheron than the Eastern express teamster.

Perhaps the most useful of creatures in a country of smaller means than ours is the pony. Until very lately no attempt has been made to domesticate him here. Shelties are now being raised in Iowa, but principally for children's use. For the multifarious smaller duties of town and country alike, where light loads only are to be hauled, it is odd that their utility has not yet been recognized. Pound for pound the pony can vie in endurance with the ass, and has speed besides.

The ass has never been domesticated in America. Except for breeding mules, or as an occasional pet, he is unknown. He belongs to the day of small things, which we, still over-rich in raw material, have not reached. And yet he is an extraordinary little fellow. In Spain or Italy, not to instance Africa or the East, the donkey, gauging his value by the work he does and the food he eats, is worth at least a dozen of the average population. He can give any horse odds of two to one, and distance him in every day's work.

His progeny, the mule, is, however, one of our most valued

institutions. In the South he is indispensable. We are wont to prize the very big mule, and many stand seventeen and eighteen hands, can pull extraordinary weight, and thrive on exposure which would literally kill a horse. But abroad, where economy in feed is more closely studied, the smaller mule is found to do proportionately greater work, to live longer, and to be more generally useful. During the Civil War the Quartermaster's Department found mules, on the whole, decidedly preferable to horses for economy, efficiency, health, and durability, though it took six mules to do the work of a four-horse team. The question of relative inducement to profanity in their management need not be broached.

The capacity of the country to respond to an extraordinary demand for horses was well shown during the war. "With reference to animals alone, the Quartermaster's Department supplied six hundred and fifty thousand horses and four hundred and fifty thousand mules. In the third year the armies in the field required for the cavalry, artillery, and trains one-half as many animals as there were soldiers."—(General Vincent).

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

A CAMPAIGN FOR BALLOT REFORM.

BY THE HON. E. BURD GRUBB.

THE aspect of political affairs in New Jersey in the early summer of 1889 was one calculated to dishearten and dismay the stoutest Republican, or, indeed, the honest man of any party who hoped for good government in the State. The legislature which had just adjourned had been Democratic in both branches, and its course in matters bearing particularly upon the approaching gubernatorial election was certainly calculated to excite suspicion and distrust. An attempt had been made to procure a reform in the ballot laws of the State, and a very excellent bill, drafted by Mr. Kane, the Democratic member from Middlesex County, embodying the best features of the Australian ballot system, had been brought up in the legislature and had been defeated, the Republicans voting for it and the Democrats voting against it. This bill had received the approbation and the support of the labor associations of the State. Then, three very important laws which were upon the statute book and had been for many years, and which were almost the only safeguard for an honest ballot which remained, were repealed. These were:

First, The Personal Registry Law.

Second, The so-called "Sunset Law," which provided for the closing of the polls at sunset, and which was specially directed againt the action of the repeaters, whose nefarious work is best performed in the dim light which prevails at the polls between sunset and dark in November; and,

Third, The Jury Commission Law, the repeal of which took the drawing of juries from a non-partisan commission, and placed it in the hands of the sheriffs of the counties. At the time of the repeal of these laws, it was believed and openly charged that the object was to make clear the way for fraud in the coming election.

This condition of affairs did not escape my attention, although I had never been actively engaged in politics beyond being twice

honored with the position of elector on the Presidential ticket. I saw, with considerable apprehension, that my name was being seriously spoken of in connection with the gubernatorial nomination; at first taken up by old soldiers,—I had just finished a term as Department Commander in the Grand Army of the Republic,—and afterwards by many of the rank and file of the Republican party. I had intended to decline the nomination before the convention met and, but for the following incident, I would have done so: A few days before the convention met the Hon. Roderick B. Seymour, of Jersey City, came to my house. He had been a captain in a regiment I had commanded before Petersburg in 1864. I knew him to be a brave soldier, and, while I had not seen him very frequently since the war, I had followed his career with interest. I knew that he had been in the legislature from Hudson County, and also a judge in Jersey City. He informed me that it was extremely probable I would be nominated in the convention, and said that from his knowledge of the present condition of affairs in Hudson County it would be impossible for me, or any other Republican, to be declared elected.

He said to me: "If you come to Hudson County with 1,000 majority, they will have 2,000. If you come with 2,000, they will have 3,000; and if you come with 20,000, they will have 21,000. You cannot possibly be *declared* elected, but it is in your power to do the honest people of New Jersey a great service, if you are willing to sacrifice yourself that far." I asked him what he meant, and he then said: "If you are nominated and accept, place me on the State Committee, which you will then have the right to do. I am sure that I can bring about a fusion between the Jeffersonian Democrats of Hudson County and the Republicans. You must then make the strongest campaign you can and endeavor to carry the Senate at least, by one or two majority. The harder you make the campaign, the worse the fraud in Hudson County will be against you. We will get the matter before the Senate, and the benefit which I expect will accrue from the fusion with the Jeffersonian Democrats will be that we will get hold of the ballot boxes after election, and the ruffians will not be able to steal them away entirely. If we can get legal possession of these boxes, a condition of affairs will be shown the like of which has never been seen in this country."

I took the matter into careful consideration, and finally I gave

my hand to Captain Seymour and told him that I would do my part of the work. He alone was in my confidence in this matter.

As soon as I was nominated, at the first meeting of the State Committee thereafter, I asked that Captain Seymour be placed upon the committee, which was done, and he immediately brought about, in the face of considerable opposition, the fusion between the Jeffersonian Democrats of Hudson County and the Republicans. The fusion was on the State Senator and some of the county officers. Turning my attention to the active work of the campaign, I found that the Republican organization in several of the counties was incomplete, the party disorganized and disheartened; and many earnest Republicans met me with the words, "It is of no use. Whatever we do, Hudson County will swamp us;" and this feeling was curiously deep and strong over the whole State.

I made the issue of ballot reform the key note in the campaign. The Democrats refused to re-nominate Mr. Kane in Middlesex, and I requested the Republicans to make him their nominee for Assembly, which they did; and this is the only case in which I personally interfered with the Assembly nominees in the State.

I made an active campaign, crossing the State five times and speaking fifty-one times in six weeks. I found the people strangely uninformed on the subject of ballot reform, and in some places I was obliged to have specimens of the Australian ballot printed and distributed at the meetings. The Democratic orators did not touch upon the subject of ballot reform at this time in the campaign, their efforts being mostly directed to interesting the honest farmers in South Jersey in estimates of how much tax would be collected the coming year upon the rails and ties of the railroads which ran through their farms, that species of taxation being openly promised them.

By the middle of October the campaign had become warm. The Republican party and many people in the State appeared to be awakening and becoming earnest and determined. Our meetings were large and enthusiastic, and in the last week of the campaign it was announced and published that the Democratic candidate for Governor had signed the pledge of the Hudson County Ballot Reform Association. This pledge was partially kept, and the present measure of ballot reform, under which the elections of New Jersey are now held, while still grossly imperfect, is a great deal better than nothing. It was wrung from the

fears of the Democratic party in the last week of the campaign of 1889. The returns of the election declared the Democratic candidate for Governor elected by a majority of over 13,000, practically all of which was from Hudson County. Immediately upon the announcement of the returns from Hudson County, which were not given in full for some days after the election, I wrote to the Chairman of the Republican State Committee, stating that I felt sure that the result was untrue and offered to do whatever might be requisite in the premises. He replied that nothing could be done. A few days after the election a series of very able articles appeared in the New York *Times*, calling public attention to the gross and outrageous frauds which had been perpetrated at the ballot-boxes in Hudson County. Then one Republican candidate for freeholder in that county,—who was apparently beaten by a small majority,—contested the seat of his opponent and succeeded in having one of the ballot-boxes opened, in which were found 105 of the small tissue ballots which were then and there called "joker" ballots for the first time. These tissue ballots were declared illegal by the Democratic Judge, Knapp, and the seat was given to the Republican upon the majority of the regular legal ballots found in the boxes.

The gubernatorial inauguration occurred on the 12th of January, 1890. The result of the election had shown a gain of two Republican Senators, which made the Senate Republican by one majority. A resolution was presented, and passed, in the Senate, directing an investigation into the election for Senator in Hudson County of Mr. McDonald, Democrat, whose majority over Mr. Stuhr, Fusion, and the incumbent at the time, was declared to be something over 8,000. Mr. Stuhr did not contest the election in the courts, but made a protest in the Senate against the seating of Mr. McDonald. An order was obtained from the President of the Senate, directed to the officers having charge of the ballot-boxes in Hudson County, ordering them to produce the ballot-boxes before the Senate in Trenton. These boxes had been carefully watched since the election night—those of Jersey City at the City Hall, and those in the other districts of Hudson County at the Town Halls of the various townships. At this point, every obstacle was thrown in the way by the Jersey City ring, and it was not until the day before the ballots could be legally burned, that by the determined action of the Sergeants-at-Arms of the Senate, under

the supervision of Capt. John Graham, the ballot-boxes were safely placed in the vaults of the State Capitol and carefully guarded.

A committee of three Senators, of whom two were Republicans and one a Democrat, was appointed, all the Democratic Senators voting against the resolution. The Senate Committee retained the Hon. Gilbert Collins and the Hon. William H. Corbin as counsel, and, being impressed with the duty which I owed to the law and order-loving people of the State, I requested the Hon. George M. Robeson to give his attention to the matter, and placed Capt. John Graham, who had been employed in collecting and guarding the ballot-boxes, at their disposal.

Provision for the expenses of the investigation having been refused by the Democratic House of Assembly, the committee applied to me for assistance, which I very gladly afforded them. The committee sat for nearly three months and inspected the contents of all the ballot-boxes in Hudson County. They examined eight hundred and twenty witnesses, and there were one thousand more waiting to be examined when the committee adjourned. They found no fraud, nor any suspicion of fraud, in any of the precincts showing majorities for the Republican ticket, and there were twenty-two of these showing a total honest majority of 1,422, but in the districts showing Democratic majorities they discovered, by the admission of the frightened criminal officers of election, by the testimony of hundreds of willing and unwilling witnesses, and by the incontrovertible evidence of the thousands of fraudulent ballots still in the boxes, each one a stab at the heart of popular sovereignty, each one bearing the evidence of its criminal purpose and of its criminal performance, the most ghastly conspiracy to defeat the will of the people that has ever been dragged to the light of day in the history of our State.

The ballot-box used in New Jersey in 1889 was provided with a piece of mechanism under the slot in the lid, and when the voter handed his ballot to the judge of election it was the duty of that officer to push it through the slot, and thereupon the mechanism stamped it with the name of the district, milled it in dark blue ink across the back, and punctured it directly in the centre of a round mark made in the milling. This was intended to be a safeguard against fraud, and, with even one honest officer on the election board, it probably would have been. We shall see how the Democratic officers of election in Hudson County used it.

The Senate Committee found that in at least ten precincts there had been a wilful false count of the ballots in the box. They found that in 28 precincts in Jersey City and Hoboken nearly 2,000 Democratic ballots were counted and placed upon the strings as genuine ballots, which had been stamped, milled and punctured by mechanism other than that of the box in which the Committee found them. These were some of the infamous "joker" ballots, on light, thin paper, very small, their entire length being only as great as the width of the other Democratic tickets used in the election. These tickets were printed, stamped, distributed and used for fraud. They were intended to give an easy method of depositing two or more votes without detection, and to give the election officers stamped ballots which they could put on the strings without running them through the boxes. Many thousands of these tickets were distributed.

So secure did these scoundrels feel in the commission of their crime that they were not always careful in its concealment, for in the district of Hoboken the genuine ticket had the name correctly spelled, while upon the fraudulent tickets the name was spelled "Hoboeken." In many ballot boxes certainly hundreds, if not thousands, of ballots were found which had not been stamped, milled or punctured, while other ballots in the same box bore all these marks clearly and plainly. Many more which were punctured bore no other evidence of having been put through the mechanism of the box, showing that they had been pushed through the slot in bunches and not singly.

The repeal of the personal registry law relegated this election purposely to the provision of a former and most pernicious law which allowed names to be entered on the registry lists by the affidavits of irresponsible persons. This, by the collusion of the election officers, produced one of the worst phases of the fraud. It has been ascertained that about 12,000 fictitious names were registered. A canvass of Hudson County which I had made after the election, and before the Senate Committee met, indicated even worse than that. There was direct evidence before the committee that repeating was very extensively done. Names were used of men who had been dead many years, and their families came and testified to this. Twenty-seven men were registered from a house that was ascertained to have been torn down two years previously. Seven men were registered and voted

as living in a certain house, and a maiden lady who there lived alone came and testified to that fact in a way that carried conviction to all, including the election officers. Evidence was produced showing that gangs of repeaters were brought from the Bowery lodging houses in New York to Jersey City, each of whom voted ten times in the Fourth and other districts.

The extent to which the substitution of false ballots, that is, the taking out of the boxes the Republican ballots and replacing them with Democratic ballots, wa spractised, it is impossible to say, but that it was done was proved. In one precinct a large number of ballots were left in the box after the counting was done. These the Democratic Judge of Election burned up.

In other districts there were indications of the same fraud. The Democratic ticket was counted as straight, no scratching or pasters being noticed by the election officers. A friend of mine at his own instance went over the ballots of a few of the precincts while the Senate Committee were examining them, and tallied nearly two thousand of my pasters which were on the regular Democratic ticket, and which had never been counted for me, but on the contrary had been counted for the Democratic candidate. The Senate Committee reported that the Hudson County Democratic Committee, composed of one hundred and twenty-nine members with their officers, met on the night before election at their headquarters in Jersey City. On a table in front of them lay several thousand of the small ballots, before referred to as "Jokers," put up in small packages, making a mass about as large as a ballot box. It is in evidence that about twenty thousand of these were printed. On the table were also packages of money, one for each precinct. The Secretary called the roll and the members came forward, one by one, and to each was handed a package of the regular tickets for his precinct and a parcel of money, and to those who would take them there was also given a package of the small "Joker" ballots. Many did take them ; some did not. The report of the Committee unseated McDonald and seated Stuhr, all the Democratic Senators voting against it. The following autumn McDonald was sent to Congress, but before he went he took his seat in the Senate, Stuhr being unseated by vote of the Democratic Senators.

Soon after the majority report of the Senate Committee was made the Secretary of the Hudson County Ballot Reform Associa-

tion presented the matter to the Grand Jury of Hudson County and asked for an indictment of the election officers. On account of the power of the ring it was found impossible to obtain an indictment for actual fraud at the ballot-boxes, but the pressure of public opinion which was then aroused, was too strong to be altogether ignored, and the Grand Jury indicted sixty-seven (67) election officers in Hudson County for conspiracy to defeat the election laws, it being supposed that conspiracy would be the most difficult charge upon which to obtain a conviction.

Of the eighty-one judges of the courts in New Jersey only five are Republicans, and none of these has jurisdiction in the State Courts in Hudson County, but the interests of law and order and of good and honest government have been nobly upheld by the Democratic Judges Knapp and Lippincott, before whom the cases were tried, and the Democratic Prosecutor, Mr. Winfield, who has been faithful and untiring in the discharge of his duty.

The Court decided to try the election officers of each precinct as an unit, and took the drawing of the jury out of the hands of the Sheriff, who was the Chairman of the Democratic County Committee, and ordered struck juries ; that is, forty-eight men were selected by the Court, of whom the Prosecuting Attorney and the counsel for the accused had each the right to strike off twelve names, leaving a list of twenty-four, from which the jurors were drawn in the ordinary manner. The election officers were defended by very able counsel, retained and paid by the Democratic ring, and through all of this contest between law and order and lawlessness and disorder these now convicted criminals have lacked neither counsel, assistance nor money, and every device known to their adroit and unscrupulous aiders and abettors has been exhausted to save them from their punishment.

The first trial took place on June 23, 1890, and lasted until Monday, June 30, and the first four election officers were found guilty after the jury had been out but forty minutes. An appeal was taken on these cases on the technical ground that each prisoner was entitled to twelve challenges under the law. This, of course, would have more than exhausted the panel of the "struck jury." Pending the appeal the accused were placed under $3,500 bail, which was immediately furnished, making the total bail bonds of these criminals amount to more than $100,000, which was easily furnished by those who stood behind them. The appeal

was defeated in the Supreme Court, and was then carried to the Court of Errors and Appeals, and after a delay of two years,—which delay, by reason of the statute of limitation, protected from indictment those who were probably the principal criminals,—in the month of June, 1892, was decided against the appellant. At last outraged justice had its due, and these pitiful tools, broken in the using, were sent to prison for various terms of from nine to eighteen months and subjected to a fine of $500 each.

Sixty-seven officers who certified to the Democratic majority in Hudson County were indicted for conspiracy to defeat the election laws. Of these, twenty-one are now in the State prison; one is out on bail, pending an appeal; twelve are in the penitentiary; one is in the City Hospital dangerously ill and not yet tried; three were acquitted; two are dead. The case against three was "nolle prossed." One forfeited his bail and paid $2,000 and has not been tried. One was fined $250. One fled and has not been arrested, and twenty-one have been convicted and not yet sentenced. Fifteen pleaded guilty.

The difficulties in obtaining this result cannot be overestimated. These criminals were aided and abetted by men who had money and power—some are known, others are more than suspected. Nothing that devilish ingenuity could devise or fear suggest has been left undone to defend and save them.

It is a terrible commentary upon the possibility of evil in our State that every known aider and abettor has been appointed to office under the State Government, and that these very criminals themselves, now clad in stripes behind prison bars, after their crime had been exposed by the Senate investigation, were appointed by the Democratic party in Hudson County as officers of the election in the spring of 1890, and conducted that election. These same criminals, after they were indicted and convicted, were borne upon the pay-rolls of Jersey City and Hudson County, and paid by the money of the people for services not rendered by them, and one, immediately upon his release from his nine months' imprisonment, under indictment and conviction for conspiracy, has been replaced in his old position and his name is now borne upon the pay-rolls of the city at $1,200 per year.

The true result of this election no man has ever known. The truth is buried so deep in heinous fraud that human probe will never reach it. But, throwing out the returns from these districts,

whose election officers were sent to jail by Democratic courts, and taking no account of the similar frauds, all in the interest of the Democratic ticket, openly charged and in some cases clearly shown, in other counties of the State, and standing on the honest, undisputed legal ballots which were cast and counted for me, and against which not a breath of suspicion was raised in all the State, I was elected Governor of New Jersey.

I did not make a contest, for this would have aroused partisan feeling and made still more difficult, if not impossible, the great result which has been achieved. An honest election can now be held in New Jersey. I have proved that three years ago this was impossible.

The honest people of New Jersey will always revere the memory of Judge Knapp, who fell dead in the discharge of his duty, fighting against the crimes of these very men, and those behind them. They will honor Judge Lippincott, the honest and incorruptible Jerseyman, who despises that which is evil and supports faithfully and loyally that which is good—and they will not forget the services of Charles Winfield, the Prosecuting Attorney, whose untiring zeal and fiery eloquence have been more than a match for the powers of evil which were arrayed against him; neither will they forget the services of Capt. John Graham of Jersey City, an honest, faithful, and fearless Republican, who has followed these felons to their den and dragged them to the light of day, and whom I have seen bruised, bloody and beaten in the discharge of his duty, but who, when once he seized his man, never relaxed his grip until he had him safe in jail.

As for myself, the people of New Jersey may remember that in the last sentence of my letter accepting the nomination for Governor, I said I would rather be defeated in a fair and honest contest than receive an election tainted with any suspicion of fraud at the ballot-box.

I have not changed my opinion.

EDWARD BURD GRUBB.

A BLOW AT THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

BY HANNIS TAYLOR.

IT IS rather a startling statement, and yet one which is deliberately made without any qualification whatever, that under the Constitution of the United States, as lately construed by the Supreme Court, Congress possesses the same censorial and despotic power over *the intellectual contents* of all communications, written or printed, open or under seal, which pass through the mail, that was exercised at the end of the middle ages under those European systems which denied the right of all literature to circulate, save "such as should be first seen and allowed."

In the judgment lately rendered in the freedom-of-the-press cases,* the first in which the rights of the press under the federal constitution were ever presented for adjudication, it was held that the limitation in the First Amendment, which expressly provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," in nowise restrains the autocratic power of that body to look into the contents of all documents passing through the mail, and to exclude all, when *the ideas* which they seek to disseminate are "condemned by its judgment." Or, as the Court itself has still more pointedly expressed it, the federal government has the right "to refuse the facilities for the distribution of matter deemed injurious by Congress to the public morals;" it may decline "itself to become an agent in the circulation of printed matter which it regards as injurious to the people." Congress may refuse "to assist in the dissemination of matters condemned by its judgment, through the governmental agencies which it controls."

There can be neither cavil nor question as to the result which has been reached; the declaration has been clearly and curtly made that Congress possesses the autocratic power to exclude from the mail every document, public or private, political, religious or

*_In re_ Rapier. _In re_ Dupré, 143 U. S., 110-135.

social, whenever the ideas or principles which it seeks to disseminate are "condemned by its judgment," as injurious to the people. The only possible restriction which rests upon this new-born despotism is embodied in the proviso that Congress does not possess "the power to prevent the transportation in other ways, *as merchandise*, of matter which it excludes from the mails." In other words, the Court holds that that clause of the constitution which expressly prohibits Congress, by name, from passing any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, guarantees to the people no right whatever to disseminate their ideas through the only agency which Congress controls, provided that body does not attempt to interfere with their transportation, as merchandise, over routes which it does not control. The circumstances under which this judge-made proviso—a proviso which has prostrated at a blow the bulwark which the fathers fancied they had built up between Congressional tyranny and freedom of opinion—came into existence, constitute one of the most remarkable episodes in our judicial history.

With the advent of the art of printing the press was everywhere in Europe subjected to a rigorous censorship, the essence of which was the right of the church or state to say beforehand that no book or paper should circulate when the preliminary license was withheld by the functionary or council possessing the power to grant or withhold the *imprimatur*. During the reign of Elizabeth the general regulation of the rights of printing and publishing was actively assumed in England by the supreme censorial authority of the age, the Star Chamber, and when in the reign of James I. the first newspaper made its appearance the novel and obnoxious form of public discussion which it introduced was promptly silenced by its imperious mandate. When, upon the fall of the Star Chamber, the censorship passed for a time from the Crown to the Parliament, the restraints previously imposed upon freedom of discussion suffered no relaxation.

After the Restoration the entire control of printing and publishing was resumed by the Crown and placed in the hands of its agents, under the licensing act of 1662, which substantially embodied the iniquitous system the Star Chamber had administered. That act, originally limited to two years, was renewed, with a short intermission, down to 1695, when the whole censorial system perished forever in England through the refusal of the Com-

mons in that year to reënact the statute by which it was upheld. The practical result of this silent revolution was to forever withdraw from the Crown and the Parliament that despotic censorial power which they had so long exercised over opinion, through the irresponsible agency of political functionaries. After the censorship was thus overthrown by the failure of the licensing act in 1695, the only restraints which remained upon the freedom of opinion were the judicial restraints embodied in "the law of the land," which were only enforceable through the judgments of courts based upon the verdicts of juries. And yet, even after that point had been reached, it was found that the battle had been but half won, for the reason that, under "the law of the land," as construed by the judges, with Mansfield at their head, it was held that the main question—the character of the utterance itself—was a question for the judges alone; while only the subordinate and not often disputed fact of publication could be submitted by the accused to a jury.

Such was the doctrine persistently enforced in Westminster Hall in that famous series of prosecutions for criminal libel which, beginning with the prosecution of Wilkes in 1763, continued until after the adoption of the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States. In these, as in all other cases of criminal libel, "the only material issue for the jury to try, was whether the paper was libellous or not; and this was emphatically declared to be entirely beyond their jurisdiction. *Trial by jury was the sole security for the freedom of the press*; and it was found to have no place in the law of England."* Against this monstrous usurpation of judicial power it was that Erskine thundered until his voice so stirred the English people that, by the declaratory statute known as Mr. Fox's Libel Act, introduced in 1791, and passed in 1792, the high court of parliament itself adjudged that the constitutional law of England had ever been, and ever should be, as Erskine had so long and so brilliantly contended. The heart of that contention was that the essence of that freedom which Englishmen call "the freedom of discussion," and which Americans call "the freedom of speech and of the press," is the right of every one to say or print whatever he pleases subject only to the censorial power which resides in juries alone. Or, as a great authority has lately expressed it, "Freedom of discussion

* May's "Const. Hist.," vol. ii., 114.

is, then, in England little else than the right to write or say anything which a jury, consisting of twelve shopkeepers, think it expedient should be said or written."* When—a century after both the Crown and the Parliament had abdicated forever all right to interfere with the freedom of discussion—the principle was thus finally settled that the legality or illegality, the *morality or immorality*, of the contents of any book, letter or newspaper circulated in England could only be considered and passed upon by a jury fresh from the ranks of the people and imbued with their sentiments, the keystone was put into the arch upon which the whole fabric of Anglican freedom of opinion, on both sides of the Atlantic, has been superimposed.

It so happened that while Erskine was waging his majestic warfare for the establishment of that liberty, which Lord John Russell has called "the guardian and guide of all other liberties," the federal convention of 1787 met for the performance of its duties. It is not, therefore, strange that the din of the conflict which was then rife in the streets of London and in Westminster Hall should have impressed the American people with the necessity of carefully guarding the freedom of speech and of the press alike against judicial tyranny and Congressional interference. Although the earnest effort made in the convention to insert a special limitation to that effect in the original constitution failed, simply because it was deemed unnecesary, the matter was not lost sight of. The instant that it was settled that the new constitution was to be supplemented by amendments which were to embody a bill of rights, five States sent up to the first Congress, in as many different forms, the suggestion out of which was carved that clause of the First Amendment which expressely forbids Congress, by name, from making any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." Thus was this vital provision set in the forefront of our National Bill of Rights as the corner-stone upon which our free constitution was to rest for all time.

As the formulated outcome of a then recent revolution, the plain, obvious, and settled meaning of the term, "freedom of speech and of the press," was at the time of the adoption of the First Amendment known to all men, even to the judges. It was perfectly well understood by everybody that the clause in question was intended to deny to Congress the power to erect in this

* Dicey's "The Law of the Constitution," 231.

country that kind of a *political* censorship which had passed away from the Crown and the Parliament a century before the American Revolution began; that it was intended to deny to the judges the right to establish that kind of a *judicial* censorship which Mansfield had struggled in vain to uphold; that it was intended to guarantee to every American citizen, so far as the federal government was concerned, the right to speak or write what he pleased, subject only to the censorial power which resides in juries alone. So perfectly was this principle understood that when in 1798 the Congress, through the infamous act known as the Sedition Act, struck its first blow at the freedom of the American press, it was careful to provide that all accusations which should be made under it must be tried by juries armed with the power not only to pass upon the fact of publication, but upon the vital question involved in the subject matter of the publication itself.

It had not at that time entered into the brain of any American jurist, statesman, or partisan that Congress might, in the very teeth of the First Amendment, assume censorial powers, and withdraw from juries the right to consider the supreme question whether or no the subject matter of a publication is moral or immoral, legal or illegal. And at a later day, when it became necessary for Congress to prohibit the circulation through the mail of immoral literature, the same constitutional guarantee was kept steadily in view. There can be no question that under the original grant of authority to Congress "to establish post-offices and post-roads," plenary power was given to regulate the entire postal system of the country, subject only to the subsequent limitation that in the exercise of such control it shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press,—the plain and simple meaning of which is that no one shall be punished on account of the contents of any document sent through the mail until a jury has first determined, under "the law of the land," that the same is either immoral or illegal. Frankly recognizing this historic limitation upon its powers, Congress, in the perfectly constitutional statute forbidding the circulation through the mail of immoral and obscene literature, expressly provided that in all such cases the fact whether the contents of any given publication is immoral or obscene can only be considered and passed upon by juries alone. In the leading case of U. S. vs. Bennett, 16 Blatch., 343, the judge in submitting the only ques-

tion at issue to the jury said : "The only question, therefore, which you are called upon to decide is whether or not the book is obscene, lewd or lascivious, or of an indecent character. Now you have had this book in your hands, and the district attorney has marked certain passages as the matter you are to determine upon." Here the whole matter is reduced to its narrowest possible compass. The act against the circulation of immoral literature, which was not drawn in a paroxysm of excitement, exhausts the entire constitutional authority over the intellectual contents of documents passing through the mails that Congress can exercise. By virtue of the law of criminal libel, which is part and parcel of the First Amendment, Congress can punish every offender who sends an immoral or obscene publication through the mail, leaving it to a jury alone, under the constitutional guarantee, to determine in each case what publications are immoral. When that act was passed, it never occurred to Congress that it might, by flatly ignoring the First Amendment, re-create the mediæval censorship and establish an "*Index Expurgatorius*," for all such publications as its arbitrary judgment might deem obscene or immoral.

If the decision lately made by the Supreme Court,—to the effect that all communications may be arbitrarily excluded from the mail, when the ideas which they seek to disseminate are "deemed injurious by Congress to the public morals,"—be a sound one, then at its next session Congress may amend the act against immoral literature by incorporating into it a black list of all the books and papers which have passed under the ban of its censorial judgment. Of course, in such a list Congress can, if it sees fit, enter the New Testament alongside of the works of Voltaire ; and when the Christian shall cry out against the sacrilege, and the heathen shall rage against the injustice, the short answer can be given that the Supreme Court has said that Congress, while in the exercise of its power to regulate the intellectual contents of the mail, is as supreme and infallible within the contested domain of morals as the papacy itself,—that its autocratic discretion is, within that domain, absolutely unrestrained by any limitation whatever. Thus, through an *ex cathedra* revelation from the Supreme Court, made at the close of the nineteenth century, and in a land which poses in the garb of "Liberty enlightening the world," *the dogma of the infallible State* has been set up as the counterpart

of the dogma of the infallible Church. There can hardly be a doubt that neither Congress nor the Supreme Court would have permitted themselves to be dragged into this grotesque position, so dangerous to the future liberty of the country, had not both bodies been seduced by the fatal argument that the vastness of a temporary evil which they were called upon to suppress, and which they alone could suppress, justified the sacrifice.

Never until the passage of the act known as the anti-lottery law, approved Sept. 19, 1890, did Congress ever venture to assert that it possessed the power to exclude newspapers and other publications from the mail by reason of their contents. That act, although designed to destroy the Louisiana State Lottery Company, operates directly upon the publishers of all American newspapers who claim the right to print what they please, subject to the limitations which the First Amendment embodies.

Two publishers who resolved to resist the power of Congress to exclude their newspapers from the mail, because they had seen fit to print in their columns matter concerning a subject which that body had proscribed, in due time presented the constitutional validity of the act for adjudication in the Supreme Court of the United States. In the cases there presented the contention was clearly made that the power originally vested in Congress to regulate the postal system of the country was afterwards expressly fettered and limited by that clause of the First Amendment which forbids Congress, by name, to make, in the exercise of its regulating power, any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press;" that that formula is an historic one whose settled meaning, in both the English and American precedents, is that the *legislative* department of government can never consider or pass upon the morality or immorality, the legality or illegality, of anything that may be said or written by citizen or subject; that the character of all utterances, whether written or printed, presents purely a judicial question which belongs to juries alone; that the attempt made by Congress to adjudicate that all publications or other utterances touching the business of a lottery are *per se* immoral, is a gross usurpation of judicial power.

As it was the first time in the history of the Republic that the publisher of an American newspaper had ever sought protection at the hands of that Court against what he claimed was a gross attempt to violate his rights upon the part of the American Con-

gress, it was certainly to have been expected that an exposition would have been made worthy of the subject and of the occasion. But the Court deemed otherwise. In a brief statement from the Chief Justice the announcement was made that the Court held the act constitutional because the question at issue had been adjudicated adversely in the case of *ex parte* Jackson (96, U. S. 727), a case which arose twelve years before the rights of the press in the mail were ever assailed, a case in which no one connected with the press appeared, and in which its rights were neither involved nor represented. The statement thus made does not pretend to be an independent adjudication; it simply purports to be a reiteration of what had been said in *ex parte* Jackson.

The leading purpose of this review will be to demonstrate (1) that no *adjudication* as to the freedom of the press was made, or could possibly have been made, in *ex parte* Jackson, that what was there said on that subject was the veriest of all *dictums;* (2) that in the *dictum* which then first saw the light appeared the judge-made proviso which has practically eliminated the freedom-of-speech-and-of-the-press clause of the Constitution by excluding it from the only field in which it was ever intended to operate; (3) that the only reason ever given for the creation of that judge-made proviso rests upon a mistake as to an historical fact.

In *ex parte* Jackson the only party before the Court was a person who had deposited in the mail "a circular letter concerning a lottery offering prizes," in violation of a statute forbidding the mailing of such "a letter or circular." At that time there was no law in existence which pretended to interfere with the circulation of newspapers through the mail in any manner. The right and the only right involved in the Jackson case was the "freedom of speech," a right kindred to but not identical with the "freedom of the press." The constitution clearly distinguishes between them, and provides for their protection in separate phrases. The only adjudication which possibly could have been made in the Jackson case was as to the "freedom of speech," and the inexplicable fact is that counsel utterly failed to present, or the Court to suggest, the one clear and historic ground upon which that right has ever depended. So long had it remained unassailed that its very nature and history had been forgotten. The short answer to the whole matter was that Congress could not exclude the circular in question from the mail, by virtue

of its contents, for the reason that the sender had the right under the First Amendment to have the legality or illegality of its contents passed upon by a jury of his peers before any penalty whatever could be imposed upon him. And yet, without ever considering the one simple question really involved in the case, the Court held that the political department of the government could take the jury's place and make the adjudication. Not content, however, with thus trampling upon the vital right actually before it, the Court felt called upon to go outside of the record in order to define what would be the rights of newspapers in the mail whenever a future statute should be passed forbidding their circulation through that channel. While thus engaged in the domain of purely abstract speculation in regard to the rights of the press, which were not presented for adjudication until thirteen years thereafter, the Court encountered an obstacle which seemed absolutely to bar its way to the conclusion which it was necessary for it to reach in order to make its policy for the suppression of lotteries complete and "thorough."

Only once before the Jackson case arose had the question of the power of Congress to exclude publications from the mail, by reason of the ideas which they sought to disseminate, been discussed by the jurists and statesmen of the country, and that was in the memorable debate which took place in the Senate in 1836 upon the report presented by "the select committee to which was referred that portion of the President's message which relates to the attempts to circulate through the mails inflammatory appeals to excite the slaves to insurrection." In the midst of great excitement President Jackson appealed to Congress to pass a law to exclude such inflammatory appeals from the mail, and Mr. Calhoun was appointed chairman of a select committee of the Senate. After an exhaustive examination of the whole subject, and with every motive to reach an opposite conclusion, Mr. Calhoun reported in the most emphatic terms that the First Amendment absolutely prohibited Congress from excluding any communication from the mail by reason of its contents. As a way out of the difficulty, however, he suggested that Congress could pass a law authorizing any deputy postmaster in any State or Territory to refuse to deliver any newspaper or other publication touching the subject of slavery where, by the local law, their circulation was prohibited. In reply to that untenable position, which attempted to

find in the States a power Congress had not, Mr. Webster delivered the clearest and most exhaustive exposition ever made of the freedom-of-the-press clause of the constitution considered as a direct limitation upon Congressional power. With him there was no fumbling, no lack of historical knowledge. Diving at the central question, he at once perceived that the limitation in the First Amendment was intended to be applied to powers which Congress really possessed and not to powers that it did not possess ; that its plain purpose was to guarantee to newspapers the right to circulate *through the mails*, the only means of circulation which Congress could control, and not *outside of the mails*, by means of transportation which Congress could not control. "What was the liberty of the press ?" he asked. "It was the liberty of printing as well as the liberty of publishing, in all the ordinary modes of publication ; *and was not the circulation of papers through the mails an ordinary mode of publication* ?" Guided by his unerring legal instinct he then declared that any attempt by Congress to exclude publications from the mail, by reason of their contents, would be a gross usurpation of judicial power. He said it would be admitted that if a newspaper came directed to him he had a property in it; and how could any man then take that property and burn it without *due form of law* ? And he did not know how this newspaper could be pronounced "*an unlawful publication* and having no property in it *without a legal trial.*"*

Mr. Clay, who took part in the debate, concurred in the result of these views, and the Senate refused to tamper with the matter at all. Such was the character of the lion which stood in the path of the Supreme Court when it undertook to create the grim and novel doctrine which first saw the light in the *dictum* announced in *ex parte* Jackson. To sweep away at a brush a conclusion in which Webster, Clay, and Calhoun had concurred, through a process of argument at once invincible and historic, was a serious undertaking, and yet the Court was undaunted. At the critical moment necessity became the mother of discovery. The Court suddenly found out that the superficial thinkers who had taken part in the debate of 1836 had reached an erroneous conclusion, because they had fallen into a fatal error as to a vital branch of the subject. That discovery is thus expressed :

* For the best report of Mr. Webster's speech, see Benton's "Thirty-Years' View," Vol. I., p. 586.

"Great reliance is placed by the petitioner upon these views, coming as they did, in many instances, from men alike distinguished as jurists and statesmen. *But it is evident that they were founded upon the assumption that it was competent for Congress to prohibit the transportation of newspapers and pamphlets over postal routes in any other way than by mail;* and of course it would follow that if, with such a prohibition, the transportation in the mail could also be forbidden, the circulation of the documents would be destroyed, and a fatal blow given to the freedom of the press. But we do not think that Congress possesses the power to prevent the transportation in other ways, as merchandise, of matter which it excludes from the mails."

Thus it was that this judge-made proviso came into existence which declares that the First Amendment guarantees to the citizen no right whatever to send his communications *through the mail*, provided that Congress, after it has excluded them from the only practicable channel of circulation, does not "prevent (their) transportation in other ways, *as merchandise.*" For the making of this judicial revolution, for the overturning of the perfectly sound conclusion reached in the debate of 1836, only one reason has ever been given, and that is that the "jurists and statesmen" who took part in that debate utterly missed the mark through the false "assumption that it was competent for Congress to prohibit the transportation of newspapers and pamphlets over postal routes in any other way than by mail."

What was said and written during the debate of 1836 is a matter of record; and, after a very careful examination of that record, the assertion is made that the only person who really had anything to say as to the power of Congress to control the transportation of documents "over postal routes in any other way than by mail" was Mr. Calhoun; and, as his report shows, he emphatically declared that Congress could *not* exercise any control over their transportation in that manner. In his anxiety to emphasize the want of power in Congress to abridge the freedom of the press at all, Mr. Calhoun said, by way of antithesis, that if it were once conceded that Congress could exclude documents from the mail, by reason of their contents, some extremist would claim next that Congress could declare all roads post roads, and then extend the exclusion to their transportation even in that manner.

Thus, out of Mr. Calhoun's solemn and convincing argument that it would be *monstrous* for any one to contend that Congress could hinder the transportation of documents "over postal routes in any other way than by mail," has arisen the charge that he

and all others who took part in the debate of 1836 were befogged by a diametrically opposite "assumption."* When the fragment from Mr. Calhoun's report which the Court has quoted is taken with the context, it is obvious that the Court has read an affirmative where a negative is written. The misapprehension is clearly the result of a hasty reading of a long document.

From what has now been said it clearly appears that the judgment rendered in the freedom-of-the-press cases rests alone upon the *dictum* announced in *ex parte* Jackson; and that the only reason ever given for that *dictum* rests upon nothing more substantial than a palpable mistake as to an historical fact. And yet the sad truth remains that by the phantom hand of the "legal fiction" to which that *dictum* has given birth the beacon light of free thought, which the fathers set upon the housetop of the constitution, has been for a time extinguished. Sir Henry Maine, in his great work on "Ancient Law," has told us that the most subtile and irresistible device ever employed by judges to change the effect of positive laws and constitutions, without changing their outward form, is what is known to lawyers as a "legal fiction." "The *fact* is that the law has been wholly changed, the *fiction* is that it remains what it always was."

The *fiction* set up in this matter is that the right of a citizen to have his communications transported, as merchandise, *outside of the mail*, over impracticable routes which Congress does not control, fully satisfies the terms of the First Amendment.

The *fact* is that the power now recognized in Congress to arbitrarily deprive the citizen, *without a legal trial*, of the right to send his communications *through the mail*, the one agency which it does control, takes away the only substantial right which the First Amendment was ever intended to guarantee to him.

Such a result, so at variance with all reason and all precedent, cannot of course be permanent. This new-born heresy—created to meet a special emergency—will be utterly repudiated by the American people the moment that the despotic and irresponsible power over opinion, with which the fiat of the Supreme Court has armed Congress, is applied, as it surely will be, to some subject which will arouse and quicken the public conscience.

HANNIS TAYLOR.

* The report may be found in full in Niles' "Register," vol. 49, 408-411.

INTERNATIONAL YACHTING.

BY THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN.

THAT yachting is the most charming of pastimes and yacht racing the most engrossing of sports, is a proposition so practically self-evident and so scientifically sound as scarcely to require elaboration in argument, especially among English-speaking people, for in their hearts the sea, and life thereon, inspire genuine joy. Exceptions of course exist in those unfortunate human beings whose torpid natures are incapable of thrilling to enthusiasm of any kind for anything or anybody; and in others whom the sea dislikes or who dislike the sea. To them the sea says nothing. They may be pitied and dismissed. But most of us love the sea and love it greatly, as indeed we must if we love it at all, for dear ocean is a mistress claiming much because giving much. Lovely, exacting, and imperious, she expects the devotion and homage that her beauty and the happiness she can bestow entitle her to demand. She will brook no half love; no qualified affection or conditional devotion will satisfy her; we must either love her or hate her; she is either very kind or very cruel to us.

Some men, it is true, pretend to like yachting, because other men or—what is more likely—because some women yacht; but in reality they hate it, and are happy only when viewing the delicate proportions of their ship from a point of stable equilibrium on the pier or promenade. By such half-hearted lovers fair ocean will not be wooed. Owing to some deficiency or superfluity of nature, which, alas, medical aid is powerless to supply or remove, their most heroic efforts fail in producing that nice balance of the emotions which results in sensational unconsciousness of the movements of a vessel at sea. Much to be pitied are they. The man who would be a sailor but is sea-sick is worthy of commiseration; not so he that is not sea-sick and yet loves not a life at sea; such an one is an immoral person, a waster of a precious gift, and as such should be thrust beyond the pale of the church and, what is

infinitely worse, cast out of the confines of "society." But to the man or woman who takes real delight in the sea, who drinks in the salt freshness of it, who loves the ever-living play of sun and shadow on the waves, who revels in the delicious laziness of calms, whose spirits rise with the breeze, and to whom it is pure exhilaration to guide and watch the little ship fighting like a live thing with the storm, to the happy human creature who, being something of a "sailor-man," takes pride in his ship, yachting is the finest, cleanest, most pleasurable and most healthful pastime in the world.

And yacht-racing is and always will be superior to any other sport in the eyes of those who, in addition to the love of sea life, take delight in keen competition, watching the exercise of some of the highest human qualities, and the exhibition of consummate skill, and in seeing the human intellect patiently and scientifically applied to a problem infinitely intricate and exceedingly difficult to solve. And truly the problems presenting themselves to the designer, sail-maker, and sailing-master of a racing vessel are complicated to the last degree.

How most successfully to drive a body through the water by the means of the motive power of the wind acting upon the sails, is the question that puzzles men and turns them gray-headed before nature should have thinned or whitened their locks. The designer has not merely to discover the form of solid body which at various rates of speed will excite the smallest degree of resistance in passing through the water: for the body is not solid. It is hollow: it must have buoyancy and suitable accommodation for all the living and dead freight on board. It must possess stability, real and acquired—that is, natural, by means of breadth, and artificial by means of ballast—if the expressions are allowable. It does not proceed on a level keel or at any uniform angle, but at angles varying at every moment, and the contour of the body must be adapted to these various angles. Neither does the wind exert its force upon it from a fixed direction, nor propel it through water uniformly smooth or constantly rough. On the contrary the propelling power strikes from various angles on the surface of the sails; and the sea, as we all know—and some of us to our cost—has a reprehensible habit of becoming on the shortest notice agitated in the most disagreeable manner.

Every point of sailing suggests an appropriate and different

form of hull. The shape that is well adapted for one kind of weather is ill adapted for another sort; vessels that move as by magic in light airs, may be of little use in a wholesale breeze; one that is by no means a flier in smooth water may be very hard to beat in a seaway; in short a vessel must be light enough to be driven easily by a moderate breeze, stiff enough to stand up to her canvas in a hard wind, shallow enough to be docked with ease and to run with speed; she must have depth enough to hold her up to windward, breadth enough to give her stability; she should be long enough to reach well and short enough to turn well to windward, low in the water so as not to hold too much wind, with plenty of free board to keep the sea off her decks. The satisfaction of any one requirement necessitates something antagonistic to some other requirement equally clamorous for satisfaction. Your vessel, to be perfect, must be light, of small displacement, and with the centre of gravity brought very low; she must also have large displacement, and the ballast must not be too low in order that she may be easy in a seaway; she must be broad, narrow, long, short, deep, shallow, tender, stiff. She must be self-contradictory in every part. A sailing ship is a bundle of compromises and the cleverest constructor is he who out of a mass of hostile parts succeeds in creating the most harmonious whole. It is not strange that designers pass sleepless nights, and that anything like finality and perfection of type is impossible to conceive. No wonder that yacht-designing is a pursuit of absorbing interest.

And what is to be said about the sail-maker, the artist whose business it is to cut the cloth so as to obtain the greatest amount of energy from the wind? Numerous considerations must be weighed and balanced in his case also. The shape which will secure the best angles at which to present the canvas to the wind, and from which the wind will glance off the sail with the least possible friction, has to be sought for. It may to the ignorant seem easy to cut sails, but in reality it requires a genius to do so. And when the whole fabric—hull, spars, sails, rigging, and gear—is completed, and that most marvellous product of the human intellect and of human workmanship, a racing yacht, is intrusted to her proper element, and floats upon the bosom of the sea, what is required of the men who sail her and above all of the man who directs their work?—courage, nerve, endurance, the faculty of commanding men, intense quickness, consummate judgment, and

of course perfect technical skill in the handling of his ship—a combination of rare qualities rarely to be found in one man. A ship is like a live thing, like a charming, fractious, contradictory, incomprehensible, altogether delightful female creature. She has her moods, as all will agree who have struggled with them. One day she will sail, and the next day she will not sail a bit. She will be sulky and dissatisfied with something—goodness knows what—with herself, or you, or neither, or both, for an hour and two, and then suddenly becoming sweetly good tempered for some utterly undiscoverable cause she will act with the docility of an angel.

It is this human waywardness of disposition in inanimate matter, and the knowledge that there is a cause for it all, if only it could be found out, that lends so unflagging an interest to yacht-racing. And it is the man who can best trace back effects to causes that makes the best sailing-master. The faculty is instinctive and inherent in some gifted individuals. The racing skipper is not made ; like a poet he is born. Much might be written on this theme ; but after all the best proof of it lies in the fact that the first-class designers, sail-makers and skippers on both sides of the Atlantic may be counted on the fingers of a man's hands.

Of the intrinsic delights of the sea, the charm of the independent life, I have not space or power to speak. From habit and historical association, from the persisting strain of the old roving Scandinavian blood in their veins, the sea is beloved by English-speaking men, and they will understand what I cannot express. Enough has been said, I think, to justify my eulogy of yachting and yacht-racing as pastimes appealing most strongly to the sporting instincts, the manly qualities, the natural emotions, and the cultivated intelligence of man. This also must be said, that the sport is free from cruelty, from fraud, from everything that casts a taint upon almost every other form of sport. It is wholesome, clean and sweet savored throughout. The decay of such a sport would be a matter of deep regret for these reasons, and for others of a more purely practical kind.

I shall not be overestimating the value of our English pleasure fleet if I put it at not far short of £10,000,000. It finds employment for some 6,000 or 7,000 men at sea, and for many thousands more engaged in various industries on shore. Of the tonnage and value of yachts sailing under the stars and stripes, and of the number of hands employed in them, I have no means of forming an

accurate estimate, but no country is so richly endowed by nature with facilities for yachting as the United States, and in none has the sport established itself more firmly in public estimation. In France yachting has latterly made surprising growth.

A pastime such as this, rearing and supporting a numerous and most skilful race of seamen, and encouraging industries of such dimensions by land and sea, is a matter of national importance ; and that it is appreciated by nations with whom yachting is not, as it were, indigenous as with us, is proved by the encouragement given to it on the continent of late years. In Austria the Imperial and Royal Yacht Squadron has been founded, and, largely owing to the energy and practical knowledge of a man well known to all British yachtsmen, the Rear Commodore Prince Batthyâny-Strattmann, bids fair to become a pronounced success. The Emperor is the patron, the Arch Duke Carl Stephan—a thorough sailor—is Commodore, and the club, though barely two years old, numbers already 220 members. Tne future of yachting seems secure on the East side of the Adriatic.

In Germany we see the Emperor purchasing the "Thistle" and taking the keenest personal interest in her. Prince Henry—than whom no better yachtsman exists—owns the "Irene ;" and, with such good examples to show the way, yachting will surely flourish in the Baltic. It will doubtless receive a wholesome stimulus when Kiel is made more easy of access to British yachts by the opening of the canal ; competition will increase, and competition is the life of yachting. All this is very hopeful. No lurking danger of decay in yachting would, judging by these facts and figures, appear to exist. But there is, unfortunately, another side to the question. An aspect of the case not quite so favorable must not be shirked. In yachting the root is sound enough, but decay does appear to have set in at the top.

Yacht-racing in the large classes is dead in England and America ; or, let us hope and say, is in a state of suspended animation. For this lamentable fact no doubt the preference for steam over sail evinced by men rich enough to afford large vessels is largely accountable ; but it is due also to a considerable extent to two other causes, namely, the change that has taken place in racing of late years, and the absence of any special incentive in the shape of a prize or trophy of which the owner of a big vessel might be properly proud. Cruisers and racers (I use

current expressions though the terms are impossible of definition) tend to become distinct to a certain extent; and to a much greater extent cruising and racing differentiate more and more. In old days men lived and sailed about in big cutters and schooners, and occasionally raced them. Nowadays men race their vessels and occasionally cruise about in them. This change of habit, though small, produces large result, because if a man wants a craft for racing and practically for nothing else, the smaller classes naturally attract him. In them the cost is infinitely less and the proportion of prize money to expenses far greater. The sport to be obtained in proportion to expense and trouble is much greater also. Hence while we see the larger classes dying out, the sea is white with the tiny sails of numerous mosquito fleets. The more little ships that are built, and the more amateurs that steer, sail, and work them, the better for the sport; but at the same time it would be a thousand pities if the days of the big cutters were forever gone; for albeit the small and comparatively small classes offer first-rate sport, and afford the best possible school for making sailors, nothing can compare in interest with a contest between half a dozen representatives of a large class. A big racing cutter is the real thoroughbred of the sea. Against natural causes—the tendency of racing to become distinct from cruising, the redundancy of regattas, the adoption of steam, it is useless to repine, but can nothing be done to neutralize these antagonistic influences and to revive the large classes? I think so. What is wanted is something to make it worth men's while to build; not money, because to a man who can afford to build and maintain an 80 or 90 foot cutter it makes very little difference whether a prize is worth one or two hundred pounds; but something worth striving for, something conferring honorable distinction, some trophy that a man may win with pleasure and hold with pride. Such a blue ribbon of the sea does not exist. It ought to. I look to International racing to save the day.

When I come to consider what is to be recorded about International racing, truth compels me to sum it all in the one word, "nothing." It is true that one of the first races of which we have any knowledge was of an international character. In 1662, King Charles II. sailed his British built "Jamie" from Gravesend to Greenwich against the Dutch built "Bezan," belonging to the Duke of York, for £100, owners at the helm, and won.

Whether it be that all the energy available for a long series of matches expended itself in the one stupendous achievement of an international race with kings at the stick, I know not. But certain it is that in spite of so superior a beginning nothing further occurred in that branch of the sport, until certain British yachts crossed the Atlantic in the vain endeavor to win back the America Cup. The history of international racing may therefore be said to consist of a record of the races that have taken place in United States waters for the America Cup—for though the Royal Victoria Yacht Club presented a very handsome cup, value £500, in 1891, their generosity has as yet produced no result.* Though for years the America cup has been held by the New York Yacht Club as an international trophy open to challengers through the yacht clubs of all nations it has produced only seven races; and without saying anything derogatory of the vessels competing it must be admitted that but few of the attempts can be considered as worthy of the occasion. Neither "Cambria," "Livonia," nor "Galatea" can be looked upon as fairly representative of English racing yachts. In 1870, the year before she sailed in America, the first named schooner sailed seven races and two matches, and was beaten in both matches, and won only one race. In 1871 "Livonia" competed in fifteen races and gained only three first prizes and one second. In 1885 "Galatea" won only two second prizes out of fifteen starts.

The "Genesta" was a first-class vessel; if not the best, she was at any rate the second-best English yacht of her size afloat at that time and she made a very creditable fight. "Thistle" was built for the express purpose of sailing for the cup. She beat "Irex" on all points of sailing and was fairly entitled to be considered the champion of the British pleasure fleet of that date. She was badly beaten, so badly as to raise some doubt as to whether she was sailing up to her true form. Taking a line through "Thistle," "Irex," "Genesta," on the one hand, and through "Volunteer," "Mayflower," "Puritan," on the other, she certainly was not. But this is a mere matter of speculation. She was built for the purpose and was the best thing we could turn out. In those two instances, but in those only, the international races were full of interest and worthy of the name.

* Since writing, I have seen with much satisfaction a statement in the press to the effect that a cutter is building at Bristol with the purpose of challenging for the Victoria cup. I sincerely hope the rumor is correct.

That the America Cup should have produced so little serious competition and indeed so little competition of any kind is no doubt largely due to the lack of interest in the subject displayed in England. Yachtsmen care comparatively little about it, and the general public care nothing; the interest evinced by our brethren in the United States—I might also say by the whole nation—is unfortunately not shared by us. But some other cause must be at work. Want of general interest will not sufficiently account for absence of competition, and some adequate reason for the want of interest must also exist. It is to be found, I believe, in the fact that the difficulty of devising satisfactory conditions, and the necessity for doing so, if sport is to be insured, have never been sufficiently recognized by the holders of the cup.

The America Cup was not originally intended to be an International challenge cup. Neither was it, as is usually supposed, a "Queen's cup." It was a cup, value £100, given by the Royal Yacht Squadron to make a race for the "America." That vessel, while anxious to make matches, objected to our regulations as to time allowance, and as she would not sail in our regattas, the squadron got up a race for her round the Isle of Wight without any time allowance whatever. The "America" won the race, and would have won it under any circumstances, as she saved her time on "Aurora" by about two minutes. The actual race was not, it must be admitted, a very good test of merit, as the only two vessels having any pretensions to be racing yachts, the "Arrow" and "Alarm," came to grief at the back of the island; but of the superiority of the "America" no doubt can exist. She practically revolutionized our fleet. The owners of the famous schooner did a very sportsmanlike thing in handing over the prize to the New York Yacht Club to be held as a perpetual challenge cup, but I do not think they did it in a quite wise way. That they can never have seriously considered the conditions which ought to attach to such a cup is certain from the fact that, according to the original deed of gift, a challenger had to meet any number of yachts that chose to sail against him. Such a condition is of course absurd as applied to an International match. It is true that the "America" won the cup in open competition with a fleet of fifteen yachts, but it was not a challenge cup; she was not sailing an International race, It was an open race in which every yacht was fighting for its own hand as in the

case of any ordinary regatta. To erect the trophy into an International challenge cup and, under those totally different circumstances, to insist upon conditions similar to those under which it was won would never have been contemplated had the donors given much thought to the matter. It may be quite legitimate to chuck a shilling out of the window of the Trafalgar for a dozen little Greenwich boys to scramble for in the sweet-smelling alluvial deposit of the Thames; but if the fortunate securer of the prize, being actuated by a high sense of parochial patriotism, devotes the shilling to be a perpetual inter-parochial challenge prize, it would not be legitimate to insist that one small boy of Greenhithe should struggle against twelve small boys of Greenwich. At any rate it would not be business, and challengers would be few and far between. This error was perceived after one race had taken place, and was rectified, and since then two deeds of gift have been framed for regulating contests for the cup. It is not my intention to examine into them minutely or to discuss their legality in any way; suffice it to say that for many reasons they have been objected to by yachting men on this side. The last deed, that of October 28, 1887, appears to be especially open to criticism on account of the dimensions clause. The width of divergence of opinion that may be formed as to what constitutes fair conditions is evidenced by the difference between the intentions and anticipations of the framers of the new deed of gift and the effects produced by that document. With a copy of the new deed the New York Yacht Club sent a circular to all our yacht clubs invoking from them "a spirited contest for the championship," and trusting that the new deed "may be the source of friendly strife," inviting "friendly competition for the possession of the prize," and tendering "a liberal, hearty welcome and the strictest fair play" to all. They were evidently of opinion that the new deed was admirably calculated to insure sport.

To this circular the secretary of the Royal London Club replied saying that "I am instructed to inform you that they (the club) regret to find that the new conditions laid down by the surviving donor of the America cup are of such a nature as in their opinion to be not calculated to promote sport, by deterring British yacht-owners from challenging for the cup." Though no other expression of their views was sent by any other British clubs to the

New York Yacht Club there is no doubt whatever that the Royal London Club expressed the universal opinion of yachting clubs and yachting men in the United Kingdom. No challenge ever has been made or ever will be made under the terms of that deed. It is impossible to conceive of two opinions more diametrically opposed; and if the views of the New York Yacht Club are unchanged and unchangeable and are representative of the yachting world of America, International racing is, as far as that country and England are concerned, at a deadlock. It matters very little which body of opinion is right and which is wrong in the abstract, and the exact proportion of error in each is not worth discussing. What is wanted is to bring them together somehow. If two people propose to play a game, they must first of all agree as to the rules to be observed. It is to bringing about an agreement that practical men interested in yacht-racing should address themselves. It is not an easy, but it should not prove an impossible, task, and will not if it be approached on both sides in the spirit exhibited by Mr. Herreshoff when he said: "If the conditions that surround the tender of this wonderful cup be not such as to promote friendly International rivalry, then let the duty and wish of every spirited American yachtsman be to modify the deal so that our transatlantic friends may visit us again and stir us to yet better and higher work."

The fact is that, though at first it may appear simple, the difficulty of laying down fair rules for governing an International yacht race is exceedingly great, and by fair rules I mean rules that will preclude the possibility of the holder of a cup being taken by surprise, and that will insure, as far as is humanly possible, that the best vessel will win. The object of a challenge cup of that nature is to decide what yacht shall be entitled to be considered the champion of the world. The superiority of the vessel is the first matter of consideration, and skill in handling is the only other factor admissible in the case. That can not and ought not to be eliminated, but with that one exception the race ought to be free from anything that can possibly influence and determine its character and result. When we consider that of all sports yacht-racing is the most liable to be affected by luck, chance, accident, and flukes, the difficulty of framing rules becomes apparent. During a season's racing in which she sails perhaps forty or fifty times, the best yacht of her class will, of

course, assert her superiority. She will be beaten perhaps many times, but the average will be in her favor. It is necessary, therefore, that a certain number of races—the best out of five, at least—should decide the fate of a challenge cup, lest either of the competitors should be especially favored by weather more suitable to her than to her opponent on any one or two given days.

For the same reason it is equally desirable that the courses should be such as to fairly try the vessels on all points of sailing. They should also be laid off in deep and open water as free as possible from flaws of wind off the shore, from tides, and from any advantage that may arise from local knowledge and a pilot's skill. The possibility of obstruction on the part of other vessels must also be guarded against. The yachts must be first-class vessels, so that the winner may fairly claim the championship, not in any particular class or rig, but of the world. A minimum limit of length or tonnage, determined by the ordinary dimensions of a thoroughly sea-going cutter and schooner should therefore be fixed, and no allowance for rig should be given. On the other hand the vessels should not be so large as to be unduly expensive, difficult to handle, and practically useless for any other purpose. Men will be reluctant to build for a special purpose if they are to find themselves saddled with an inconvenient ship after sailing one series of matches in her; and it is not advisable to give advantage to the longest purse. A maximum limit of length or tonnage should therefore be found by consideration of the dimensions beyond which experience shows that schooners or cutters become inconvenient for general purposes and unwieldy.

It is obvious that, to insure a good race, the yachts should be as nearly as possible of the same length on the load water line. Length is the principal factor in determining speed, and if the challenged party can always go a few feet or a few inches longer than the challenger he obviously has a great, perhaps an insuperable, pull over his antagonist. Length on the water is in respect of yacht-racing the nearest equivalent to age in horse-racing, and to insure uniformity in that all-important particular, any excess on the part of either vessel over the estimated length, as furnished with a challenge, should be counted double in calculating time allowance—the equivalent of weight for age; and, further, neither vessel should in any case exceed the length specified in the challenge by more than two per cent. In former times when ships

were built more or less by rule of thumb such a stipulation might have been difficult, perhaps impossible to carry out. But now in these modern days of scientific precision, when a competent designer can calculate his weights to a nicety, and a competent builder can carry out the designer's plans almost within the limit of an ounce, two per cent. margin is amply sufficient to allow for any unavoidable error in estimating the floating length of a yacht with everything on board ready to sail. But as differences in rating will exist, they must be adjusted by a time allowance scale. Moreover, cases might occur in which it would be unfair to penalize length on the load water line too heavily. For instance, neither party might wish to build and might agree to sail off a challenge with two existing vessels differing considerably in length; a fair scale of time allowance would be necessary in that case also.

To lay down definite fixed rules for the actual management of the matches and the settlement of all details concerning them would of course be out of the question. Such matters are best left to sailing committees and to mutual agreement between competitors. They must arrange them as they think best, bearing in mind always that the courses should be as far as possible free from obstruction and all adventitious circumstances, that they should be properly and distinctly marked off, and that the dates for the matches and hours of starting should be fixed to suit the general convenience. The exact time at which each race is to be started should be settled beforehand and strictly adhered to. To be kept waiting in suspense for some hours and perhaps eventually started in the bustle and confusion of shifting sails, or of making some alteration rendered necessary by a change of weather or shift of wind, is very harassing to a crew. Favoritism might be shown by postponing a race, and the possibility of favoritism should be guarded against. It must not be forgotten that in framing regulations for an International race human prejudice must be considered. It should be rendered impossible for either party to have the shadow of an excuse for fancying himself aggrieved. But, as postponement is obviously necessary in certain atmospheric conditions, a sailing committee should be forbidden to start a race in thick fog. Moreover, in very bad weather a postponement might be desirable—for a gale of wind is no weather in which to try the capabilities of a vessel in a race, and, as in such case neither competitor would like to be the first to suggest post-

ponement, a sailing committee ought to be empowered to exercise their own judgment. I would suggest, therefore, that if either vessel desired it the sailing committee should be bound to start the race at the time specified, except only in the event of thick fog ; but that if neither vessel insisted upon a start the question of postponement should be left to the discretion of the sailing committee. As a necessary consequence of this rule it should be laid down that any race not completed within a certain time, calculated by an average speed of, say, five knots an hour over the course, should be void and should be sailed over again ; and that reasonable time should be given between races to repair damage occurring during a match.

The length of notice that should be given in a challenge appears to me somewhat immaterial. A club holding a challenge cup ought to be safeguarded against surprise. It should receive a challenge in ample time to build if thought desirable ; on the other hand it is unwise to hamper challengers unneccessarily and I should say six or eight months' notice would be sufficient. There remains, I think, only the question of return matches to be spoken of, and concerning it a definite expression of opinion is difficult.

Albeit the right of a country having possession of an International challenge trophy to keep it until wrested from them in a contest in their own waters is undoubted, and the champion's privilege to stand upon his own ground to meet his opponent cannot be gainsaid ; yet it would be more absolutely fair, and far more conducive to the encouragement of yacht-racing, if return matches were sailed. A yacht derives a certain advantage by sailing in her own home waters which, though impossible to estimate or define, is very real, and cannot be counteracted in any way. Moreover, a vessel built excessively slightly for the mere purpose of sailing half a dozen matches at home would have a perfectly definable pull over a vessel constructed with sufficient strength to make long ocean voyages. For these reasons a stipulation that the second or third challenge from any one country should be fought out in the waters of that country might be advisable. Another advantage which the challenged party has hitherto had over the challenger consists of the fact that while the challenger must nominate his vessel before she is tried, built or commenced, and must sail that vessel, whether she turns out a success or a failure, the challenged can build two or three ships, can try them

frequently together and can select the best. This, of course, gives a great pull to any challenged club. Whether the pull is too great or not is a matter of opinion. That the challenged should have some advantage is, I think, legitimate and fair.

One other matter may be profitably mentioned before leaving this most interesting theme. No doubt can, I think, be entertained but that the differences as to the methods of yacht measurement existing among the yacht clubs of the United States, and between them and the Yacht Racing Association of the United Kingdom, act prejudiciously upon racing and indeed upon yachting as a whole. Into that thorny field I do not propose to stray. An ideal rule would be that which resulted in the evolution of the soundest, most seaworthy, fastest, and most convenient vessel. How near that ideal human ingenuity is capable of arriving, or to what extent uniformity of rule is compatible with necessary local divergence of type, I do not pretend to say. But uniformity of measurement, if attainable, is worth struggling for. A healthy stimulus would be imparted to yacht building, and I sincerely wish that scientific and practical men on both sides of the Atlantic would consider the feasibility of such a scheme.

Such are my general ideas sent out *currente calamo* and without any attempt at scientific exactitude or legal phraseology; but before closing I would wish to make clear my definition of an International race. I do not mean a race for a perpetual challenge cup open to all the world, and to be sailed for at the annual regatta of the club holding the cup. A race of that character would be very simple to manage. It would be merely necessary to stipulate that the cup should be held by the vessel winning it—the owner giving sufficient security—and that it would be sailed for every year at the regatta of any club selected by the holder of the cup subject to the ordinary rules as to time allowance, rig allowance, etc., etc., etc., used by the club. Such a race would be most interesting and useful, but what I have in contemplation is the sailing of a series of matches between two representative vessels for the championship of the seas, and that is, as I think I have shown, a far more difficult matter to arrange. In fact the whole question of International challenges bristles with difficulties, and though I have freely expressed my opinion in these pages I should not attempt to draft the rules for its conduct.

What I should do would be this: It is no disparagement of other

countries to say that England and America are foremost in yachting matters, and no one could feel insulted if Americans and Englishmen took the lead in laying down regulations for International races. Moreover, a very large and mixed committee would never arrive at any conclusion whatever. I should therefore invite, say, three Englishmen and three Americans, representative yachtsmen and members of the foremost clubs, to meet in New York or London, or in some other convenient place—Paris might be suitable—and sit down to discuss the matter thoroughly and draw up definite rules. Their labors having been brought to a conclusion, I should put six bits of paper—one of them being marked—into a hat, shake them up and request the members of my drafting committee to draw lots. The nationality of the drawer of the marked lot should determine the waters in which the first race for the cup should be sailed, and he should nominate the yacht club in whose charge the cup should be first placed. If such means were adopted an eminently just, impartial, explicit and practical set of rules would be the result; rules which, if they did not give universal satisfaction, would at any rate be free from the charge of producing universal dissatisfaction on one side, and which would, if coupled with large latitude for mutual arrangements of details, insure good and continuous sport. Would it be possible to apply the principle here indicated to the America cup? I know not, but it would be a thousand pities to let that cup fall into oblivion. It has attained a position and notoriety that make it singularly the trophy to be held by presumably the best racing vessel in the world. That it has not produced more frequent and keener contests is much to be regretted, and no one could rejoice more than I if it could be placed in a position so satisfactory as to stimulate the activity and ambition of yachtsmen on both sides of the ocean, and should come to be recognized for all time as the blue ribbon of the sea.

DUNRAVEN.

DIVORCE: FROM A FRENCH POINT OF VIEW.

BY M. ALFRED NAQUET, OF THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

IN FRANCE, as elsewhere, many persons imagine that the law which in 1884 reëstablished divorce in that country has given a new color to the divorce question, and they are now asking themselves whether the experiment has produced good or bad results. Even if it were possible in an examination of this kind to employ the scalpel of the anatomist, the conclusion which might be reached would be rather hastily drawn, as it requires more than a few short years for a law, if it has any real influence on society, to show its effect. I might go further and add that social phenomena are far too complicated to permit us to attribute to a particular cause certain determined results. If we are to arrive at a correct conclusion we must also find out what influence was exerted at the same time by all the other active causes, a proceeding totally impossible in matters of this kind.

Thus, when the partisans or the opponents of capital punishment base their arguments on the increase or decrease of murder, as the case may be, in the countries where this mode of punishment has been abolished or reëstablished, their reasoning does not rest on solid ground. If, for instance, crime diminished the moment guillotining was stopped, who could tell but that this happy result might be due simply to an improvement in the habits and customs of the people? The diminution might, perhaps, have been still greater if the scaffold had been left standing. On the other hand, if crime increased, the cause might be sought in that feverish state produced by the excessive competition of modern civilization; and who could say whether the same improvement would not have been observed if capital punishment had not been abolished?

The same thing is true of divorce. If, twenty or thirty years after the promulgation of the law establishing it, we should observe that the number of unhappy families had increased, that there was more immorality and crime than before, it would be quite absurd to attribute to this institution all this misery; and we would be just as unphilosophical in declaring it to be the cause of an amelioration, if such had really occurred.

Have the opponents of divorce ever looked at the question in this light? I cannot say whether they have. I do notice, however, that they lay great stress on the number of families which are broken up by divorce. If this number were to diminish they might be inclined to admit that the law had done some good. But when, on the contrary, they perceive an increase in the total of the sundered households, they hold up their hands in holy horror and declare that society is in danger. Their conclusions, however, are very hasty. A law which suddenly establishes divorce finds itself necessarily brought face to face with a mass of cases which have been accumulating for years. The first act is a sort of general liquidation, which produces exaggerated optical effects. But when this clearing of the docket is accomplished, and there come up for decision only the divorce cases belonging to each successive year, then a decrease follows the increase, and the public mind is calmed.

This is exactly what happened in Switzerland. When the law passed in 1874 came into force two years later, the divorce business suddenly assumed enormous proportions, whereas to-day it appears to be entering upon a period of decrease. However, Switzerland still remains one of the countries where there are the most divorces. But the settled fact is to be noted that the increase observed was followed by a period of decrease.

Will the same thing happen in France? I cannot say positively, but the logic of the situation would lead one to answer the question in the affirmative. But I never like to get ahead of facts, and the facts in the case have not yet spoken. Printed statistics come down only to the year 1888. Now, as the divorce law passed in 1884 was not really taken advantage of till two years later, when it was perfected by the law which modified its procedure, it will be seen that we have scarcely two years of statistics before us, and these the very years when, on account of the liquidation to which I have just referred, the figures would be

abnormally high. And they were in fact very high. Thus in 1883, the year before divorce was established, there were granted in France 3,010 separations (*a mensâ et thoro*). In 1888 the number of separations and divorces together had risen to 7,166.

But whether these figures increase or remain stationary, there will be no reason for jumping to any conclusion, unless it be to this one, that, as there is much divorcing in France, the re-establishment of divorce was a crying necessity.

In Sweden, where there are almost no disunited households, perhaps society can get on without this institution. But where, on the contrary, there is a considerable number—I refer to separation from bed and board—this very number shows that the reform is needed, like a safety valve in a steam engine. In order to draw a different conclusion, it would first be necessary to establish the fact that this increase is caused by the legislation which permits married people to separate; but it is this very demonstration that nobody has made or can make, for such an allegation would be in contradiction with the truth.

M. Jacques Bertillon, the able head of the Paris Bureau of Statistics, has established in a decisive manner, seldom witnessed in matters of this kind, that the number of families which are disunited is quite independent of the legislation of a country. For instance, there are nations where the laws are the same, but where there is an extraordinary variation in the number of separations and divorces. Thus, in Switzerland, certain cantons—Geneva, Bâle and Zurich, for example—show an enormous number of divorces, while other cantons, such as Uri, do not offer a single case, though the law is the same throughout the Confederation. The same thing is seen in Scandinavia. Thus Denmark abounds in separated family circles, while in Sweden and Norway there are almost none; and yet the laws governing the matter are about the same, while, furthermore, these people are as near alike as possible in race, customs and religion.

What legislation can accomplish—I said this when I first took up this divorce question, and I shall not cease repeating it, because it is the philosophical truth—is the bringing to light of existing social facts or the checking of the manifestation of these same facts, though they exist in the same degree in both cases. Let me explain more clearly what I mean. Imagine a country where neither separation nor divorce exists. Does anybody sup-

pose for an instant that consequently there would be no broken family circles. It is evident that nobody cherishes this delightful chimera, since nobody proposes the suppression of separation from bed and board; but if the state of things which I have imagined really prevailed, there would, of course, be badly assorted unions, where the husband and wife would be found living apart, exactly as is the case to-day. But as society can discover this only by means of its civil registers and decisions of the courts, and as these means of information would be lacking in this hypothetical case, these separations would not be noted, and the statistics would contain a cipher under the heading "Separations."

Let us suppose now that this same country, where exist no legal means of dissolving marriages, takes a step in the direction of greater liberty and establishes separation from bed and board. Of course all the married couples already living in this separated state would care little for this new law. A separation of this sort has few advantages, except in special cases, where, for example, the husband wishes to protect himself against what might result from the criminal commerce of his wife and her falsely attributing to him the paternity of a child, or the case in which a wife seeks more effectual protection from a husband's evil treatment. Except in instances of this kind most people would prefer not to admit the public to a share in their domestic troubles by having recourse to the new law, and would continue to live apart amicably. Some couples, however, would avail themselves of it, so that the statistical tables, which heretofore had contained only a cipher, would now register a positive figure, which would go on constantly increasing, for it is a well-established fact that to-day in every country, whatever may be the nature of its legislation in respect to the subject now under consideration, the number of separations is continually progressing. In France, for instance, before the reëstablishment of divorce, and when, consequently, divorce could not be held responsible for the fact, the total of separations from bed and board gradually grew from 642 in 1840 to 3,010 in 1883. If short-sighted sociologists should conclude from these figures that the liberalizing of marriage legislation had produced evil results, such a conclusion would be very unphilosophical and very far from the truth. All that these statistics prove is that our legislators, in becoming less strict, had made it possible to count the cases of domestic in-

felicity which up to that time had been kept in the shade. Nobody could hold that the law was the cause of these separations.

Let us go still further and consider the situation which prevailed in France first in 1792, and again in 1884, when the law of divorce took its place beside that of legalized separation from bed and board. Up to that date a certain portion of those couples who lived in a state of amicable separation had, as we have just stated, held back from the cost and trouble of going to law. But now, finding in the divorce law a chance to begin married life over again and to create a new family, they considered that the advantages were greater than the inconveniences of a law suit, and so they were ready to go into court. Thereupon statistics would again denote an augmentation in the amount of conjugal infelicity. But would there in reality be any such increase? None whatever. These broken unions are now brought forth to the light of day. They existed yesterday and do not date from to-day. The divorce law was a sort of microscope which had enabled the statistician to see and note what was hitherto beyond his ken.

If divorce legislation becomes still more liberal, if the facilities for separation are made easier and easier, this apparent increase in the divorce column will again show itself, and this will continue until legislation embraces every case which has heretofore been relegated to the background of obscurity.

Every day I am consulted by married people in trouble. Now it is the wife who has been deserted by the husband, and now *vice versa*. The household may be broken in twain, but our present law does not recognize the cause as a sufficient ground for divorce. Again, the complainant has no proof of the ill-treatment of which she or he is the victim. But if the divorce law which was introduced in 1792 were still in force, and which declared as sufficient cause for the breaking of union the persistent demand on the part of one of the parties, these unfortunate people who consult me and who at present neither apply for divorce nor separate, would seek divorce. Then only would the official statistics mark the fact. But they exist to-day and the law which would make it possible to note them would have nothing to do with bringing them about.

It may well be asked whether, from a social point of view—and this is the only thing to be considered—mystery is preferable to publicity in a matter of this kind; whether amicable sepa-

rations which take place in spite of the law and outside of the law are less harmful than legalized ones. For my own part I am convinced that legalized separations are far less baneful, and this is why, not believing that legislation could influence in any way the number of broken unions, I determined to do what I could to secure the reëstablishment of divorce in France.

I well knew that nothing is more dangerous than to attempt by means of laws to exercise coercive powers in the domain of social phenomena, where constraint can never effect anything. The Bavarians, for instance, discovered the truth of this principle when, startled by the danger to society occasioned by an excessive birth rate, and wishing to check it among the poorer classes, they made an attempt to prohibit marriage when the contracting parties had no certain means of support; but, instead of reducing the real number of births, this law simply increased, to a disquieting degree, the total of illegitimate children; so it was promptly repealed. There was an apparent diminution in the number of marriages, but it was only apparent; for clandestine unions, with all their corrupting influences, took the place of legal ones, thus proving once more that legislation cannot check cohabitation any more than it can prevent separation.

In countries where divorce does not exist, the number of unions *officially* dissolved decreases, and there is no record of the subsequent unions formed by separated parties, but it does not follow that no such unions exist. On the contrary, illicit connections are formed and adulterous family circles are created, which take the place of regular and recognized households, while illegitimate children are substituted for legitimate ones that would have been numbered as such if it had not been for this state of things. This is the only possible outcome of strict legislation and the result does not reflect honor on such legislation.

My own convictions on this subject are so well established, that if I did not fear the reaction to which popular ignorance might give birth, I should not hesitate, if in my power to do so, to remove every obstacle in the way of divorce. Such a liberal law, which would make it possible for those living apart to legalize their situation, would so increase the divorce list, that the simple-minded public would take the effect for the cause, and would blot it from the statute book. Taking into account the degree of enlightenment of civilized countries in general and of

France in particular, I should say that the divorce law passed in the latter country in 1884 is all that we could and should expect.

Another aspect of this problem is that of divorce among the laboring classes. Some of my fellow countrymen were disturbed at the thought of opening to the democratic masses the benefits of a law, which, according to them, ought to be reserved exclusively for people in easy circumstances.

A few days ago I read in the *Galignani Messenger* an article touching on this point. The writer was frightened at the number—21,000—of divorces applied for by the Paris working classes in four years. The English organ at Paris saw in these figures a veritable danger to society. Though the courts may come to the rescue of the children of divorced parents who are rich, argued the writer, they are powerless where the parties are without a fortune; and, furthermore, as the larger part of these divorces among the working classes are followed by new unions, a mass of children are handed over to the far from tender mercies of step-mothers and step-fathers, and are thus deprived of the healthful education of the true family circle.

This objection was often thrown in my face before I succeeded in getting divorce back on our French statute book. But I found no more trouble in answering it then than now. The greater the number of applications for divorce emanating from the laboring classes, the more it proves to me that divorce answers a pressing, urgent need among the working masses of our cities.* I use advisedly the phrase "the working masses of our

* Applications, from 1884 to 1888 inclusive, for separation or divorce—I speak here of applications and not granted divorces—arranged according to the callings of the parties, are shown in the following table:

PROFESSIONS.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888
Landlords, persons with incomes, or those in liberal professions	733	1,115	915	918	925
Merchants and trades people	1.168	1,427	1,319	1,457	1,371
Farmers	615	862	855	873	821
Working people of all kinds, except farmers	1,841	2,946	3,141	3,825	3,765
Servants	227	385	474	5 3	416
Profession not given, or without profession	855	815	894	1,553	1,119
Total	5,439	7,550	7,598	9,149	8.417

This table shows that the peasantry, which forms 70 per cent. of the whole population of France, figures here for scarcely 11 per cent. Thus the total applications foot up 37,453, where the farmers represent 4,026, or 10.7 per cent.

cities," for in the country districts of France it is very rare for a peasant to take advantage of the divorce law, although its stipulations are the same for all classes of citizens. This fact verifies the truth of M. Bertillon's statement that marriage and divorce are governed by causes to which legislation is foreign.

Does anybody believe that when divorce was impossible our working men and women abandoned one another less often than they do to-day? If anybody does believe this he is very simple-minded. Then, as now, good-for-nothing wives left their husbands in order to launch into debauchery; then, as now, bad husbands, in far larger numbers than bad wives, shirked their conjugal and paternal duties. Though the official statistics are silent on this point, the facts cry aloud.

When, among the upper classes, troubles of this sort arose, relief was obtained by separation from bed and board. A husband with money who did not wish to see his fortune divided among his legitimate children and bastards would obtain a separation of this kind in order to disavow more easily any irregular offspring, while a wife would have recourse to the same law in order to protect more surely her fortune from marital dilapidation, to settle more exactly her financial position, and to remove the children from the sight of their father's immorality.

But what would be the results of such a separation when practised among the working classes? There being no fortune, no benefit would accrue from a judgment requiring one of the parties to pay an allowance to the other. The decree of the court would be a dead letter. As regards disavowal of paternity, this becomes of far less importance where the matter of inheritance plays no part. Consequently, though under the old law there was quite a number of separations among laboring people, the total was relatively small; and it may be safely added, furthermore, that these separations occurred more particularly in the more moral and well-to-do portion of the working classes. However, whether these separations were granted by the courts, or whether, as was far more generally the case, they were brought about privately, the results were far different from those among the upper classes.

Let us suppose, for instance, a husband deserted by his wife, who has proved herself to be a bad spouse and a bad mother, and has left him alone with one or more children. Or let us suppose

a wife abandoned by her husband and charged with little ones to care for. How will these different parties be affected by the situation? If they belong to the upper classes where there is a fortune, the husband will have domestics to look after the children, or he will send them to the boarding school. If weary of the celibacy forced upon him by the law, he forms an illicit union, this is at least done clandestinely, and it is kept hidden from the children, whose moral state is not harmed thereby. The deserted wife, who is blessed with money, can, in her turn, devote herself to her children's education and live with them honorably.

Now, let us turn to the working classes and see how they fare in circumstances of this kind. The deserted father can have no servant to care for the house and children. He is forced to wive again, but if he cannot contract a legal union he will contract an illegal one, for matrimony is a necessity for his own domestic happiness and for keeping his children from the street. If the union be illicit the moral effect on the children may be bad, but surely less so than if there were no woman at all to watch over them. In a word, therefore, when a workingman is abandoned by his wife he sets up a new home with his mistress.

The situation of the deserted workingwoman is still worse. As matters now stand in France, a woman cannot live by her own labor. If by rare chance she succeeds in supporting herself she must have no children, and there must be no "dead season." This is a hard and unpalatable truth which cannot be removed by the fine dissertations of philosophers and moralists. Prostitution or an adulterous *liaison* is the only means by which she can keep the wolf from the door.

When certain people point with pious horror to the 21,000 applications for divorce among the working classes, filed between January 1, 1888, and December 31, 1891, they do not grasp the real meaning of these figures. What do these figures signify, then? Simply that in four years 21,000 working men and women were forced to choose between illicit unions or divorce and a legal second marriage—that is to say, 5,250 persons per year, who, actuated by a higher morality, desired, both on their own and their children's account, to regularize their conjugal situation. If divorce had not been reëstablished, or if it had been restricted to the upper classes, what would have become of these 21,000 petitioners? Is there any one who believes that these broken

unions would have been patched up and these separated families brought together again? Not even the most determined opponent of divorce dares hold such an opinion. Clandestine unions would take the place of the 21,000 regular ones, which would surely be established in a vast majority of the cases where the divorce was granted, and the formation of a new home thus made possible.

That the systematic enemies of the marriage relation, that the partisans of "free love" should rejoice at this state of things, is easily understood, though, even from the standpoint of the latter, these irregular unions cannot be looked upon as a wholly good thing in a society where legal marriage frowns upon illegal marriage. However this may be, it is to be noted that it is not the advocates of free love who protest against the 21,000 petitions for divorce emanating from the male and female toilers of France. On the contrary, it is the determined friends of the indissolubility of the marriage tie, or, at least, those who wish to limit the extent of divorce and make it an aristocratic institution—they it is who advocate the continuation of this corrupt order of things. I for one cannot understand their attitude. I cannot see how, forced to choose between 21,000 false households and 21,000 regular ones, formed after divorce, the advocates of "holy wedlock" can decide in favor of the 21,000 irregular unions.

As for myself, while admitting that the dissolving of the marriage tie is an evil, I consider and shall always consider that, to whatever social class one belongs, divorce which enables men and women to reënter upon a legal union, is, as regards parents, children and society, an infinitely less evil than the separation obtained by the courts or agreed upon privately.

ALFRED NAQUET.

IS ALCOHOLISM INCREASING AMONG AMERICAN WOMEN?

BY T. D. CROTHERS, M. D., SUPERINTENDENT OF THE WALNUT LODGE HOSPITAL, HARTFORD, CONN.

THE great drink problem of this country is governed by forces and conditions that are practically unknown. To the scientific student a few outline facts appear, surrounded by regions of mystery, clearly under the control of laws not yet discovered.

One of these facts is the tide-like movement of inebriety when seen from a higher point of view. Thus distinct periods of years will be noted in which all forms of inebriety will increase up to a certain point, then recede in about the same ratio.

Statistics of persons arrested for inebriety, extending over long periods, will point to certain years in which a maximum in numbers was reached, followed by a retrograde movement back to a minimum. This tide-like movement is sometimes clear, then obscure. Often it is marked by both epidemic and endemic waves, and is traced in the prevalence of inebriety in towns and cities, and in the reaction noted by temperance revivals.

This psychological ebb and flow was pointed out by Dr. Westphal in Sweden many years ago, and an interval of seventeen years was indicated as the time between the maximum and minimum periods of inebriety in that country. Shorter periods have been noted by other observers in different countries.

Many very startling facts point to this wonderful cycle and drink orbit, and help to explain the strange temperance revivals which spring up and sweep over the country, dying away with the same mystery and suddenness. Such movements are undoubtedly the backward swing of high tides of inebriety. The Washingtonian revival of 1840, the Red Ribbon movement and others of recent date are good illustrations.

The histories of large cities and towns supply many startling confirmatory facts of periods of inebriety and intense temperance revivals following each other with a strange, fascinating mystery. Like the ebb and flow in politics, religion and the great social movements, these drink cycles or waves point to ranges of causes and conditions awaiting future discovery.

While many of the causes of inebriety as seen in the individual are both preventable and curable, there are other unknown psychological and physical forces that control the form and direction of the inebriety of both sexes.

Whatever inebriety is in Europe, or may have been in the past, it is in this country a brain and nerve disease, marked by mental and physical failure, exhaustion and central degeneration. Any inquiry concerning the prevalence of inebriety among either men or women cannot be answered by appeals to statistics alone.

The primary facts must be sought in the physiological and psychological conditions which favor or antagonize inebriety.

The conviction that inebriety is diminishing in this country is sustained by all scientific study and observation. Some of the facts on which this is based may be briefly stated.

Inebriety is becoming more impulsive and precipitate; the period of moderate drinking is shorter; the quantity of strong spirits used is greater and the duration of the inebriety is steadily diminishing. The inebriate of to-day is often delirious, maniacal, suicidal, and criminal in his conduct and suffers from marked nerve and brain disease. If a periodical drinker, he is often afflicted with epilepsy, general paralysis and delusional manias.

The brain and nervous system break down early, and acute diseases of the lungs or kidneys are usually fatal; or the victim disappears in an asylum, poor house, or prison. The intensity and constant excitement of American life, with its strains and drains, neglect of healthy living, and bad surroundings, the sudden changes and disappointments, and the rapid elations and depressions, are some of the prominent factors which have changed the type of inebriety. These forces bring all cases into greater prominence, and give a false appearance of a marked increase in the numbers of victims.

The fact is more and more apparent that alcohol cannot be used in moderation by the average American. The forefathers might use spirits for a life time and never be inebriates or exces-

sive drinkers, but the children who drink have only a brief period of moderate drinking. They become excessive drinkers at once, and soon merge into paupers and criminals, or die suddenly. The tremendous forces of heredity which the overstrained, exhausted generation transmits to its descendants are still more active, predisposing causes for the development of inebriety, insanity and various allied diseases. Climatic states also intensify and favor the brain exhaustion that leads to inebriety. These are some of the forces and the subsoil from which inebriety grows luxuriantly. The prominence of such cases is not evidence of their increase, but by contrast brings into view the increasing number of total abstainers.

Thus the form of inebriety is changing, and while certain local causes may account for its apparent increase in particular sections, a great antagonistic undercurrent of evolution is slowly and surely drawing lines of limitation and breaking up the soil from which it grows. This is true in a large sense concerning inebriety among women. Inquiry along the lowest levels of social life, as noted in court records of women arrested for drunkenness and petty crime, confirms this. Such records are worthless as evidence of the inebriety of women, because they depend on the opinions and impulses of judges and officers who may wish to shield or expose the culprit. Inebriety is associated and covered up with assault, larceny, misdemeanor, breach of peace, and other charges that seem to alternate one with the other, and such persons are arrested many times for the same offence the same year.

Recently a woman was arrested in Liverpool, who had been arraigned over seven hundred times for drunkenness and its associated charges. Women seen in the police courts in this country charged with such offences are always profoundly degenerate, both mentally and physically. They are commonly the mere wreckage of worn-out foreign families far down on the road to race extinction. Drunkenness, prostitution, and lawlessness of all forms in women are unmistakable signs of disease and early dissolution. They are the unfit and the last remnants of the race-stock hurried on to death by a law that knows no shade or shadow of turning. Only a small minority of American women are found at this level. On the street at nightfall, in large cities and low circles, a certain number of inebriate women may be

found, but these are largely poor demented beings of foreign birth, paupers in mind and body.

Higher up in society it is a noticeable fact, that on occasions of great public excitement, as at political conventions, horse races, and other meetings where both sexes mingle and spirits are used freely, intoxicated women are rarely seen. The same is true in society, on the street, at the theatre, and other public places. Within a few years wines have been gradually disappearing from the social boards and society begins to frown on any excess manifest in public. These and other facts sustain the belief that American women are becoming more and more temperate.

It is the common observation of both specialists and family physicians that inebriate women are concealed often as skeletons in the households, and that strong efforts are constantly made to cover up their personality. Associated with the use of spirits is an increasing dread of exposure and a shrinking from society, and even from relatives and friends, and also a disposition to retreat behind the mask of various nervous diseases. When spirits are used for any length of time the disorders take on a periodical form in which hysteria and other emotional symptoms are prominent. It may be said to be a rule, to which the exception brings ample proof, that the use of alcohol in women very soon merges into some other disorder, usually drug-taking, and the spirits are abandoned.

The decrease of drinking among women is fully confirmed by the facts of heredity. In families of moderate and excessive drinking parents, the girls rarely become inebriates, while the boys, as a rule, develop the parents' maladies.

Numerous instances like the following are within the common observation of every one : One or both parents may use wine on the table daily. The father may use wine to excess, at intervals or continuously and the mother be a nervous and neurotic woman. The boys will drink to excess sooner or later, and the girls will have a defective nervous system, and turn to narcotics for relief, using opium, chloral or other drugs. The children of these girls will develop inebriety and similar diseases from the slightest exposure. Alcoholism may appear in the female side, but it will be exceptional, and naturally merge into drug-taking or other disease. It may appear in a paroxysmal form, and apparently start from irregularities of life and living, but it will always be found associated with nerve and brain defects.

The direct alcoholic heredity running through the male line is changed and diverted in the female side. This heredity always leaves the females with defective vital force and unstable brain vigor, also with weak power of control. The strain of the reproductive period brings on central exhaustion, with a strong tendency to organic disease. The female neurotic may use alcohol for the exhilaration which it brings, but only until she discovers some other drug with more pleasing effects.

Vast ranges of causes are at work far back of the first use of spirits or drugs. The brain exhaustion and consequent unrest of certain people, together with the constant strain to adjust themselves to the changing conditions of life, will of necessity produce a certain number of inebriates, both alcoholic and opium, together with various nervous diseases. This class will be limited and quickly crowded out. Certain local causes may seem to favor their increase at certain times, but behind this there is an inherent antagonistic force that limits this form of degeneration and checks its increase. It is the law of the survival of the fittest, which is of universal application.

The emancipation of women from the slavery of caste and ignorance, and the steady upward movement in mental and physical development, will prevent any general increase of alcoholism or inebriety. Psychological drink-waves may come and go, and tides of degenerative emigrants may bring an increase of inebriety for a brief time, but remedial forces will quickly neutralize and readjust the race march from the lower to the higher.

Many causes which seemingly are very active in Europe, increasing the number of female inebriates, do not exist here. Inebriety over there is a condition more or less fixed; here it is an accident and incident constantly changing. Change of climate, surroundings, and environment are often potent remedies for this accident. American women are great travellers, great observers, and great readers of current history. They are far more sensitive than men to the evolutions and revolutions of daily life. The constant educational forces of travel, of lectures, of the theatre, of literary societies, of churches and reform movements, of public schools, and the possibility of leadership and prominence in many directions, all lead away from alcoholism. When these forces are followed by nerve and brain exhaustion they will favor drug-taking more than the use of spirits.

Temperance-reform movements are largely sustained by women. A recent writer has said that over half a million women are active workers in the temperance field, and not one per cent. of this number have been or are users of alcohol or opium. Among men a very large per cent. of active temperance workers are reformed inebriates. One reason for this is that women alcoholics and opium-takers quickly disappear from society and shrink from all publicity or possible reference to their past. Another reason is advanced that women are the greatest possible sufferers from inebriety, and hence are more sensitive to the dangers of drink, and turn to reform movements for relief.

In England, it is asserted that patent medicines composed largely of alcohol are popular and have an immense sale among women. In this country such medicines are sold almost exclusively to moderate and excessive drinking men. The division of bar rooms into general and family entrances (the outgrowth of the last few years) is thought to be evidence of increased drinking among women. A slight inquiry will show that it is the opposite. It is a sign of the growing ill repute of the saloon, and the desire of its patrons to conceal their visits.

For several years past a noticeable falling off in the sale of spirits to families in cases and packages has been apparent in all large towns and cities. The family trade of stronger liquors and wines is changing to light beers and mineral waters. A rapidly increasing demand has sprung up for table mineral waters, and every drug and grocery store is supplying this want. This is limited to the homes of the middle and upper classes, and such waters are consumed by the women as well as the men.

If, as some men assert, women are becoming drug-takers, using narcotics with increasing frequency, there is little or no evidence of it in public observation. There can be no doubt that there are many women inebriates who use both alcohol and opium. If the number is increasing they would become more prominent, and the evidence of this fact would be clear and accessible in many ways.

The American woman has never been a straggler in the race-march, but is always in the van, and a wide survey of the field will show that inebriety of all forms must of necessity be diminishing.

T. D. CROTHERS, M. D.

A MONTH OF QUARANTINE.

BY E. L. GODKIN.

THE administration of the quarantine in the port of New York during the month of September last has excited the attention of the civilized world, and called forth from most observers outside the city, as well as in it, almost unmeasured condemnation. The medical journals of both Europe and America have treated it as in some manner barbarous and inhuman and inefficient. I might fill one number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW with short extracts from the savage criticisms passed on it by the non-professional journals of the civilized world. Somehow or other it has cast discredit on American government and society all over Europe. Moreover, as a matter of fact, it did not keep the cholera out of this city. Five genuine cases of Asiatic cholera occurred in September within the city, and the spread of the disease was prevented only by the energetic action of the Health Board.

The person on whom this great burden of censure fell was, of course, Dr. Jenkins, the Health Officer of the port, and I, therefore, in common I presume with most other readers of THE REVIEW, took up his article on "Quarantine at New York," in the November number, with great interest, expecting to find in it an answer to the charges of inefficiency and barbarity, either in the shape of simple denial or of valid excuse. This interest was increased by the fact that he has remained silent until now, under a torrent of indignation from the persons who have passed through his official hands, such as few public officers have ever been called on to encounter. To my great surprise, however, the article is a simple narrative, or, as he calls it, "abstract of what happened" during the cholera scare, without any allusion to the alleged defects in his management, which have called forth so many expres-

sions of disapproval. The "abstract," is an account of his action in the case of the "Normannia," which he says "was repeated with every steamship which arrived with cholera on board." I may, therefore, confine my examination of his story to the case of the "Normannia" alone.

The place in the public service Dr. Jenkins filled in the month of September was, for the time being at all events, probably the most important in the United States. It called for great and well-known talent as an administrator, and great and well-known experience as a sanitarian. I say "well known," because the Health Officer at a great port in times of pestilence, or any officer charged with the task of meeting any danger likely to cause a popular panic, needs to be a man in whose judgment the public places implicit confidence. His word as to the extent of the danger, and the value of the precautions to be taken against it, needs to be a word to which all will listen and on which all will rely. Now, anxious as I am to avoid even the appearance of personality of any kind in these remarks, I cannot omit mention of the fact that Dr. Jenkins fulfilled none of the above conditions.

The statute from which Dr. Jenkins derives his powers provides that on the arrival of an infected ship in Quarantine, the passengers shall be "immediately" removed, the sick put in hospital, and the well discharged without "unnecessary" delay, and the ship and her crew then thoroughly disinfected. This is what sanitary science now prescribes. The Advisory Medical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce further recommend that the passengers should be removed to a "safe and comfortable place of detention;" that their baggage should undergo most "careful investigation," and be subjected to "reliable processes of disinfection." They also say that the detention of the passengers on board the infected ship, according to the old method, "usually, if not invariably, involves the sacrifice of human lives, extreme and prolonged mental and physical suffering on the part of the passengers, and such an unnecessary detention of the infected ship, as is seriously detrimental to the pecuniary interests of her owner."

Now let us see, under the light of these indications, in what manner Dr. Jenkins dealt with the infected ships in the month of September. As he tells the story in his article everything was done that could or should be done, under the rules of modern

sanitary science, except the removal of the passengers from the ship. For failure to remove promptly I do not think he was to be blamed. He could not with the resources he had at command provide a "safe and comfortable place of detention" for 500 passengers of the "Normannia," even with the eight days' notice of her coming which he had. The city had provided no sanitarium and it could not be hurriedly improvised. Therefore, the quarantine which he had to propose for the "Normannia" was the old-fashioned mediæval one, consisting in the detention of the well passengers on shipboard until all danger seemed to have passed. Let us take in detail his description of his methods :

"All sick, as well as all suspects, were transferred to hospitals on Swinburne Island." Not one of the sick or suspects was so transferred for thirty-six hours after the arrival of the ship.

"The dead were also landed." The dead lay in the steerage in some cases twenty-four hours.

"I notified the Hamburg-American Packet Company to send down water-boats, so that a supply of Croton water might be on board." No Croton water came on board for five days after the ship's arrival. The crew and stewards were during all that period drinking, and the passengers were washing, in the Elbe water taken on board at Cuxhaven. The Hamburg-American Packet Company sent down no water-boats, because the crews refused to go, and the authorities had not provided this indispensable instrument even of a proper old-fashioned quarantine. The ship arrived on Saturday morning, and fresh water only came on Wednesday night at 9 o'clock, just as the captain had determined to break bounds and go up to the wharf to get it.

"The company sent down a transfer boat, and all the immigrants, with their baggage, were landed on Hoffman Island." But not for thirty-six hours after the vessel's arrival.

"Dr. Sanborn, one of the most experienced assistants on my staff, and a man who knew exactly what to do, took up his residence on board the steamship. It was largely owing to his efforts, I think, that everything went as well as it did." Dr. Sanborn did not take up his residence on board until five days after the ship arrived, the captain having in the meantime been struggling to disinfect the ship with his own crew and a scanty supply of disinfectants sent him by the company.

"The dead were removed at night, to save the feelings of the

living, and were cremated." Some of the dead were removed with very little regard to decency in broad daylight, in my presence, and it was solely owing to the exertions of a few of the passengers in clearing the side of the ship on which the transfer boat lay, that the process was not witnessed by the whole of the cabin passengers.

"The baggage of the saloon passengers was washed down with the bichloride solution." The baggage which the passengers had in their staterooms, and which was much more likely to be infected than that which was in the hold, and was enormous in quantity, was subjected to no process of disinfection or examination. The passengers took it away with them just as it was.

Dr. Jenkins makes no mention of the transfer of the passengers to Fire Island, but that was marked by two serious offences, one sanitary and the other administrative. The first consisted in crowding the second-cabin passengers, among whom a case of cholera was supposed to have occurred, in with the first-cabin passengers, among whom no such case had occurred, on a small excursion boat, the "Cepheus." The other was hurrying them out in the open ocean, late in the afternoon, without a pilot, and against the advice of the captain, and without saloon or decklights, and without a doctor or medicines, to reach a difficult inlet on a very dangerous coast. This attempt ended in failure. The second was like unto it, and consisted in sending the same boat with the same passengers on the following day, without proper information as to the possibility of landing them at Fire Island, although threats of armed resistance had been rife for several days. Dr. Jenkins passes these incidents over without a word. I append here, in support of the above statements of mine, the following extracts from the report sent to Governor Flower by a committee of doctors on board the ship, headed by Dr. Lange, well known as one of the foremost surgeons in this city, and made on the fourth day of the "Normannia's" quarantine, Tuesday, September 6:

"(1). At no time have there been facilities to remove the sick immediately after the onset of the choleraic symptoms; even dead bodies have been kept on board for twenty-four hours and more.

"(2). At no time an official thorough inspection of the ship has been made, nor have any measures been taken with regard to disinfection except such as were possible with the insufficient supply of disinfecting material carried on board.

"(3). Disinfecting material has not been furnished promptly, in spite of the request of the ship's authorities. Their demand made on Saturday, 3d, to place on board the ship an official expert to supervise and execute thorough disinfection has not been complied with.

"(4). The water supply of the ship has not been taken care of in the proper way; although by Monday morning the tanks were clean and ready to receive fresh water, such is not on board at the present hour.

The second-cabin passengers were, as a result of this too hasty action, on board this little boat for fifty-six hours, or from noon on Sunday till 6 P. M. on the following Tuesday, without regular meals or beds. The first-cabin passengers were on board the same boat under similar conditions for thirty-six hours, 600 persons in all, with no place in which to lie down but the floor. Had cholera broken out among them during this period, and especially cholera of the swift Asiatic type, against which Dr. Jenkins was guarding, the patients would have had to meet his or her fate on the bare deck, surrounded by a crowd and without nurse, medicines, or vessels. The only cholera remedy on board was a small quantity which one of the passengers, Dr. Sillo, of New York, had hastily thrust into his pocket at the last moment on board the "Normannia," when he heard to his amazement that the passengers were being transferred to the "Stonington," without a surgeon or medicines.

The case of the "Bohemia" was, if possible, a still worse illustration of these methods than the "Normannia," but Dr. Jenkins makes no mention of her in his article. She arrived, to use his own language, "infected from stem to stern," having 664 steerage passengers, and a record of 52 cases of cholera and eleven deaths during the voyage. She was detained in quarantine with all her passengers on board for fourteen days. After the fourth day no fresh cases occurred; but seven days later, the passengers still remaining huddled together, the disease broke out again, five fresh cases occurring, with two deaths, eight hours after the attack. Who was responsible for these deaths?

The mental condition of a large body of people likely to be detained on shipboard in danger of infection for an indefinite period ought, to be one of a Health Officer's first cares. His first visit to the ship should be devoted to the business of cheering them up, particularly when, as in the case under discussion, he has to deal with a large number of women, of invalids, of elderly persons, of persons whose money is running low, whose

homes are distant from the port, all of whom are likely to be profoundly depressed by finding their journey suddenly arrested under these appalling circumstances. He should at once cal them together, explain the situation, make its brighter side as prominent as possible, tell them of the provision he is making for their health and comfort, and of the conditions on which their liberation depended, and provide prompt and regular means of communication with their friends on shore.

In the case of the "Normannia" nothing of the kind was done or attempted by Dr. Jenkins. His visits to the ship were very brief, and passed in short private chats with the captain, and his one public address to a very considerable number of the passengers was a threat made on the second day of quarantine to keep the whole body in confinement for full twenty days if any of them wrote to the newspapers, or rather to a particular newspaper with which he seemed to have a quarrel of some kind. The mail and telegraphic communication with the shore for the first three days could hardly be said to exist, and in its absence people availed themselves of such surreptitious facilities as were offered by the newspaper reporters and the crews of the quarantine boats. Later it became more frequent, but was to the last very slow and irregular. A letter took, on an average, two days to reach the city, which kept friends on shore, who supposed that cholera might kill in five hours, in a state of agonizing suspense. In fact Dr. Jenkins' attitude towards the passengers' correspondence was that of the warden of a penitentiary towards the letters of the convicts. He persistently refused to deliver a letter addressed by Mr. Grainger, a leading citizen of Louisville, Ky., to the care of a person in the office of a New York newspaper, and compelled him to change the address before consenting to take charge of it.

The leading medical paper of New England, The Boston *Medical and Surgical Journal,* has declared this September quarantine of New York a "national disgrace about which the less said the better." From this view every thoughtful citizen will dissent. A "national disgrace" is something which should be incessantly talked about as long as its recurrence is possible. No good man should hold his peace about a public abuse, as long as it exists and a remedy is within reach. The New York quarantine is in no better condition to-day than it was on the 31st of August last. The danger which brought to light its defects in

such a hideous way in the following month has not disappeared. The best opinion of the sanitarians is that cholera is likely to recur in the spring in Europe, if not here, and should it find us still unprepared "national disgrace" will be a mild term, especially in the year of the Columbian Fair, to apply to our condition. If Congress and the President do not this winter put the whole business of protection from foreign infection into the hands of the Federal authorities, they will be guilty of almost criminal negligence. This done there would be a uniform system in every port, and at this port, the great gateway of the country, the quarantine service would be managed by the trained masters of organization who make our army and navy a subject of national pride, aided by the advice of our leading sanitarians who, as the London *Lancet* says, are in this field "men of the highest eminence."

E. L. Godkin.

"WAGES OF SIN."

GENERAL PARESIS OF THE INSANE.

BY HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS, M. D., MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE RANDALL'S ISLAND HOSPITALS.

OF ALL the diseases that menace the race, only a few are absolutely fatal. Indeed, there is but one common disease that invariably brings its victims speedily to the grave. This most ruthless of maladies is that terrible form of insanity technically called general paresis or paretic dementia, and known to the layman as "softening of the brain." Its unvarying history entitles it to precedence over consumption, cancer, Bright's disease; in short, places it peerless in bad preëminence. And as if this were not enough, its malignity is emphasized by the way in which it juggles with its victim before it extinguishes his life. It changes his personality, dethrones reason, almost eliminates the mind, and, steadily weakening the body, leaves towards the last a mere skeletal, vegetative being scarce recognizable as the vestige of his former self; unknowing, unfeeling, mindless, to his friends at once a tearful memory and a terrible objective presence. Finally death comes in a form horrible enough to be the fitting climax of so awful a disease.

To make the image yet sadder, and hence truer, it should be added that paresis usually selects for its victims the more intellectual members of the community. "Selects," did I say? Rather, I should have used the passive tense; for paresis does not come unbidden. Ruthless as it is when once it has seized a victim, it need have no terrors for any one who does not invite it by his actions. And this, perhaps, is the saddest fact of all in the sad history of this baleful disease. To stand helpless and see a strong man cut down by disease is always appalling; but to feel that his disease was preventable; to know that he is but reaping as he has

sown; to have the words come unbidden to your lips, "the wages of sin is death,"—this is indeed a bitter and humiliating experience. Yet such is the lot of the physician as often as he meets a case of paresis. Powerless to stem the tide of this disease he must stand aside, reproaching himself and his art, while victim after victim goes down to certain death before his eyes. Only one thing remains for him; he can give a warning cry to those who are unwittingly treading the path that leads to this pitfall. Exactly this is my present purpose. Let me briefly describe this dread disease; let me then tell of the way of life that leads to it.

Imagine, if you please, a strong man of exuberant temperament; one of those buoyant souls who carry into middle life the spirit of perennial adolescence; to whom at forty, as at fifteen, every goose is a swan and every lass a queen. You all know the type: a large-hearted, generous, thrifty man; active, energetic, successful, usually good-humored, at times irritable, excitable; one who does nothing by halves; who speaks and lives always in superlatives. All his experiences are recounted in hundreds and thousands; each day is the finest or foulest he ever knew. He knows no happy mean; his pathway lies always on high mountains or in deep valleys.

But there comes a time when his exuberance seems to forsake him. He is often depressed, even hypochondriacal. His intimates note a change in his disposition; he is more often irritable or angry. At times his memory fails, his judgment lapses; he commits indiscretions that are "unlike him." He himself becomes alarmed and consults a physician. Rest and recreation being prescribed, he goes to the mountains or the seashore. A few weeks later he returns "a new man."

For half a year he is like his old-time self. Then some day he surprises his friends by announcing a scheme for making "hundreds of millions." He invites all his friends to join him in the enterprise, promising each a few millions. His plan may contemplate the cornering of a market, the bridging of the Narrows, a new system of railroads, aërial traffic to Europe, or what not, according to his previous bent, for delusional ideas seldom cut altogether free from the sane line of thought which they supplant. The idea, possibly, may be a feasible one, or altogether Utopian; in either case the promulgator regards it as a certainty all but realized, and is unabashed by skeptical criticism. He has ready

answers for all objections—answers so visionary as to fully expose his mental condition. His friends very likely think he has been drinking, for this phase of the disease is strangely like some stages of intoxication. They advise him to go home, and think to see him all right on the morrow.

But his exhilaration does not subside. He is incessantly active, and he cannot sleep. It is proved that he is not drinking, yet his seeming intoxication increases. He makes the wildest purchases—pianos, jewels, furs, furniture, horses, houses—anything and everything at any price, as long as his money or credit lasts. Finally he becomes altogether ungovernable, perhaps dashing wildly along the street, accosting strangers and promising them millions if they will enter into his schemes. His judgment is altogether in abeyance, and chaotic emotions rule supreme.

Attempts to restrain him at home proving futile, the patient is sent to an asylum. Here probably he goes from bad to worse for a time. Perhaps he is incessantly maniacal, raving and cursing incoherently. Or he may be the embodiment of happy fatuousness; singing, whistling, shouting, rambling on from one topic to another; developing an elaborate scheme for money making, only to abandon it for another and yet another, each more ridiculously visionary than its predecessor. Or perchance his unbridled imagination does not run in monetary channels. He is a giant, a person of astounding strength, a man of marvellous learning, or a wonderful inventor. Whatever he has striven for without attaining in his sane moments will be likely to claim his shifting attention now, and unchecked imagination will carry him at a bound to higher pinnacles than his most idle day-dream had ever dared to fancy. If he has been a man of versatile mind, his powers now are all superlative. He is a great teacher, preacher, lawyer, doctor, inventor, author. As imagination shifts on untrammeled, he becomes king, emperor, Deity. He cures with a touch of his hand, threatens to kill with a glance those who offend him; he blesses and curses with indiscriminate fervency.

If the case is to run a typical course, the patient finally rallies from this condition; excitement subsides and apparent convalescence supervenes. His friends feel that he is making a good recovery; but the expert knows that the disease is merely progressing towards that painfully delusive remission which characterises it. It suggests the very refinement of cruelty to see a patient

come out of acute mania into a condition so simulating normality that his friends believe him entirely well; a condition perhaps enabling him to return to his business and the ordinary relations of life; and yet to feel that this is all but an illusion; to know that after a few weeks or months of this remission, the disease will renew its active attacks, with a certain sequel. Yet such is another of the painful features of this malignant disease.

Indeed, marked remissions are a characteristic feature of the malady. Usually there are several of these in the course of the disease, but the one that follows the first maniacal outburst is usually much more pronounced than the rest. Each remission marks, seemingly, a time when the recuperative power of nature temporarily overcomes the destructive power of the disease. This would seem to be a time when art might come to the aid of the more benign but weaker force, but alas, we know not how this may be done. In the present state of our knowledge, nothing is more certain than that the destructive force will ultimately prevail in every case of paresis. Some day perhaps it will be otherwise, but I speak of things as they are.

During the very best remission, the patient is not to the practised eye absolutely well. He has not quite his original degree of mental force. It is significant, too, that he cannot appreciate the severity of the attack through which he has passed. He will seldom concede that he has actually been insane, but will be ready with would-be-plausible explanations of all his bizarre actions. Often the remission proves a most disastrous stage of the disease. Through weakened judgment and perverted emotions, the patient is likely to make absurd business ventures. He may be decoyed from his friends by some woman who formerly could not have tempted him, but who now secures his ready money and a will bequeathing her his entire estate. If a bachelor, he commonly marries his mistress. And it is difficult to annul any contracts made at this time, because to casual observation the patient seemed so well.

The most remarkable remission may last for several months. Then comes the inevitable relapse. This may take the form of a convulsive seizure; or of a maniacal attack, usually less active than the first; it may be a condition of stupor; but whatever its guise it marks the beginning of the end. The fatal termination may come at once, a blessing in disguise, but usually it is delayed

for several months, sometimes for several years. The steady decline of body and mind furnishes one of the most pitiable spectacles. The patient's skin becomes of a pasty hue; his face loses its natural expression; his speech is indistinct and slurring, his gait unsteady; his muscles flabby and wasted.

Meanwhile, his mind is again made up of shifting emotional states. He revels in grandiose ideas. He is a king, a deity, a multi-millionaire, the owner or the maker of the world, a giant, the strongest and handsomest of men. He owns horses that can trot a mile in a minute; yachts that sail around the globe in a day; engines that run a thousand miles an hour; houses made of solid gold set with diamonds.

A grandiose idea has but to be suggested and he imbibes it. For example, a paretic who was parading as Napoleon came in contact with one who claimed to be Mahomet. Pointing him out to me he said, laughing, "Isn't he crazy, though!" "How so?" I replied. "Why, he thinks he is Mahomet." "Well, how do you know that he is not?" "How do I know?" with an air of surprise and injured dignity; "How do I know? Why, I am Mahomet." Accepting this idea, which had never until that moment occurred to him he at once acted upon it, ceased his military strutting and ordering and began praying, probably for the first time in his life. But presently the rival Mahomet angered him by questioning the authenticity of his revelations. He became enraged, and swearing fiercely, as had never been his habit when sane, now declared that he was John L. Sullivan, and would whip the impostor within an inch of his life. Tottering about the hall with scarcely the strength of a child, he declared himself able to tear down the walls of the building, Samson-like, and destroy his enemy; he refrained from doing so only because some of the attendants were his friends. This suggested yet another idea; he forgot his anger and his strength, and begged piteously of his "friends" that they would unlock the door and release him, promising each a gold castle and a hundred beautiful wives from his oriental harem in return. Mention of the (imagined) harem again shaking the kaleidoscope of his mind he forgot his request almost before it was made, and started upon an enthusiastic description of the debaucheries of his earlier years—an extravagant narrative in which, it is to be feared, he was supported by more than a film of truth.

Such are the vacillating emotional states that make up the mental life of the advanced paretic. Still later, the emotions sink to a less and less degree of elaboration, until at last about all that remains of mind is a fatuous sense of well-being. His body correspondingly weakened, the patient lies in bed, unable to care for his slightest needs; his face a blank or illumined by a hideous smile that tells only of mental vacuity. If given food he swallows it voraciously, but he would starve with food by his side and choke with water before him, too mindless to carry either to his mouth. Swallowing is instinctive, but he gulps as eagerly at the lather placed by the barber on his face as at the choicest viands. The sense of taste, like all the other senses, is practically annulled.

Voiceless, mindless, wasted to a skeleton, seeming a mere vegetative organism, he is still human, still the father, husband, brother of beings who love the memory of what he was, and who pray for the death of the sad image that remains. Surely now it would seem that the time had come for the close of the piteous tragedy. Yet often it is prolonged month after month. And when the end does come, it is not the blotting out that one might expect, the mere snuffing of a spent candle. Instead it usually comes as a convulsive seizure or a series of seizures. A horrible spectacle, whose only mitigating feature is the fact that the patient himself does not suffer; he lies oblivious in coma. Indeed, the whole course of the disease, after the initial stage, has been to the patient a prolonged euthanasia. But the friends? To them the years of decline have been one long, hideous nightmare, compared to which the course of consumption or of cancer is a thrice-hallowed blessing.

Such, in bare epitome, is this dread disease, paresis,—a disease that has numbered among its victims some of the best-known authors, some of the best-loved actors, noted statesmen, eminent lawyers and physicians, prominent business men, and hosts of men who were above mediocrity. Usually, as I have intimated, it attacks strong men in the prime of life; and I have outlined the temperament that most invites it. But, of course, other temperaments, though less susceptible, are not exempt; and sometimes a younger victim is selected. I have seen one youth of eighteen in its toils, and several who were just turned twenty. They had begun to " see life " very young.

Of course it is not to be understood that the stages of this

disease follow an absolutely fixed routine. The abnormal is everywhere only a perversion of the normal, and until we have two organisms exactly alike we shall never see two identical cases of any disease. Still the essential symptoms of typical cases of paresis are singularly uniform.

But aberrant cases do occur. Sometimes, for example, the patient runs the entire course of the disease without any maniacal outburst. He simply becomes indifferent to his surroundings; his memory fails; all enterprise, energy and business capacity are lost; he sits dreaming inanely all day long, his mind becoming finally reduced to a drowsy sense of satisfaction, varied at most by fits of temper. His moods are the moods of a child, and he is as easily diverted and controlled. Such cases often do not require asylum treatment at all. They pass down a more even decline than the typical cases, but the goal is none the less sure.

In other cases the early, hypochondriacal stage of the disease is much prolonged. For weeks or months the patient is intensely depressed. His mind is made up of doubts, fears, and questionings. Some of the most piteous appeals for sympathy I have ever seen were letters written by patients in this stage of the disease, attempting to describe their own feelings. This period of depression is always present, but sometimes it so long antedates the maniacal outbreak that its significance is overlooked. Whether long or short in duration, and whether it comes days, weeks, or months prior to the mania, it is the borderland between rationality and the condition of fully developed paresis. From this borderland the patient looks back longingly and regretfully upon his sane past, and catches fearful, though vague, premonitory glimpses of his awful future.

It seems paradoxical that the patient who during this early stage thinks himself lost forever, will a few weeks or months later, when the fatal disease has more firmly fixed its hold, declare himself absolutely well—better, stronger than ever in his life before—and laugh to scorn any one who contradicts him.

Whatever the dominant mood of an insane person, he will cling to it despite all reasoning or entreaty. Nor in this are they very unlike the sane. Our own feelings must ever be our criterion of belief in the last resort. What I myself experience, not what you experience, will be my test. Seeing—by which is meant personal observing or feeling—is believing with us all.

This fact explains the apparently anomalous conduct of the paretic. During the early stage of his disease he will not admit a ray of hope, because he *feels* hopeless. Later on, though his body is weak and every faculty and function is failing, he cannot be persuaded that such is the case, because he *feels* well.

But why, it may be asked, does the patient experience feelings so at variance with the facts? Usually a person feels ill because he is ill, or well because he is well: why is it otherwise with the paretic? Now the "whys" of things physiological are not always easy to make out; nevertheless, it happens that we are able to give at least a proximate solution of this seeming anomaly. Every one knows that the brain is in some way indissolubly connected with the mind. It appears further that the activity of the mind depends, whatever the link of connection, upon the circulation of the blood in the brain. Under normal conditions, the blood supply is regulated and momentarily changed in accordance with impressions sent from the outer world. But in the brain of the paretic, the mechanism that should regulate the blood supply is out of order. During the early stage, a free flow of blood is not permitted. Hence the mind is persistently sluggish and depressed. Tell the patient that he has fallen heir to a fortune: no responsive thrill goes through his mind. Entreat him to cheer up: he cannot.

Later on, through a different maladjustment of the controlling mechanism, the brain of the paretic is permanently surcharged with blood. A perpetual sense of well-being then encompasses him. Tell him that he is ill: he laughs at you. Assure him that he is doomed to an early grave: he replies, "I will live a century." He feels, as he never felt before, the lust and strength of youth. The circulation in his brain is persistently overactive; his ideas correspond.

But over-activity means excessive wear on the mechanism of the organism, just as on an inanimate machine. Hence the brain in which this abnormal activity prevails wears out rapidly. Its cells degenerate and become useless. At last it is so wasted that its functionings produce only the most rudimentary mental states. Then the tissues become so weakened that small blood vessels burst, lacerating the brain, and bringing on those convulsions which are so painful a feature of the disease, and which finally terminate the patient's life. Post-mortem examination

will show that the brain of the paretic may not be "softened," but that its cells and other tissues are everywhere more or less degenerated or decayed. It is inconceivable that these wasted tissues could be replaced with normal ones; hence it cannot be even hoped that an advanced case of paresis will ever be cured. But of course there is a time in the history of every case when decay is only incipient. At the disease in this stage preventive medicine may hope some day to aim its shafts successfully.

So much for the disease, paresis. Now, as to its cause. It can be epitomized in two words: excessive action. Paresis is a protest of nature against abuse of function. Whatever act tends to bring too great or too continuous strain upon the blood vessels of the brain, tends to weaken them, and thus invites paresis. All mental over-activity brings such a strain. But few of us are gifted with working enthusiasm that will ever menace our minds. Still there are cases doubtless in which mental overwork of a strictly legitimate kind has been an active factor in paving the way for paresis. Business stress and worry are far more common factors. Alcohol is a yet more potent accessory. But in the vast majority of cases, though these accessory causes have their effect, the chief causes of paresis are habits and excesses that I cannot properly more than hint at here, working on a foundation laid by a disease whose name I may not mention because it is in itself a synonym for immorality. I need not elaborate, even could I do so with propriety. This disease, these habits, these excesses are but too well known. I have tried to make visible one of their commonest sequels.

It will now be plain why paresis is a disease of civilization,—sad commentary though that be; more common with men than with women; more prevalent in the city than in the country; and one that is claiming a larger coterie of victims year by year.

I have often wished that I might have beside me a company of the bright young men of the period when it has been my duty to stand by the death bed of a paretic, that I might say: "Young men, the pathway you are treading leads to this abyss; turn while there yet is time; let this frightful example teach you wisdom." But I fear that such a warning would for the most part be in vain. I recall the remarks of a paretic who one day in humble mood said to me sadly, "Ah, Doctor, the fate of these poor beings (his fellow patients) ought to be a warning to the

unrighteous. They have all come here through excesses; through crimes against God and their fellow men and women."

"But, David," I replied, "have not you yourself been guilty of many such excesses?" All his piety vanished in an instant, and a joyful reminiscent light came into his eyes as, grasping my arm, he cried: "Excesses. Have I? Why, all these hundred fellows together have not had as many *liaisons* as I; and I shall have as many more. *I* am invincible; these things only strengthen *me*." And chuckling gleefully, he tottered off down the hall, "to convert that poor sinner yonder." Paretic though he was, I fear that his feeling is typical of the judgment of most of us regarding ourselves. We are willing enough to point a moral at the expense of our friends—but at their expense only.

Hence I doubt not that most free livers who read these pages will at most stand aghast for a moment, and then go on in the old path, saying lightly: "Oh, these things will never injure me." There is one class, however, of whose lasting attention I feel well assured. I mean those who, as they read, fear that this disease has already secured a hold upon them. Believing the horse to be stolen, these will rush eagerly to lock the door.

Now above most other things I would regret to pose as an alarmist. So I hasten to reiterate, for the benefit of these frightened ones, what is everywhere implied in this paper. If you have lived a measurably temperate life, you need not fear paresis. Whatever your symptoms, whatever your disease, you have not, and will not have, this disease. I should be sorry indeed to frighten any hypochondriacal dyspeptic into an early decline. But, on the other hand, I shall have no compunction at all if my words carry consternation into the ranks of the transgressors. I only hope that the warning has not come too late.

But most of all I could wish that this warning might reach the young man who has only thought of and has not yet started on the alluring, but illusive, pathway of which I am speaking. An ounce of prevention is everywhere worth a pound of cure. But here we may safely modify the old adage with the paretic's own figure of speech—hyperbole—and read, a *grain* of prevention is worth a *ton* of cure; for one may prevent paresis always if he begins in time; he may cure it—never.

HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

PLAYWRIGHTS AND LITERARY MEN.

THE plaint that literature and the drama are constantly getting wider apart is not a new one and is only a corollary to the proposition that play-writing is in a sad state of decline. These ideas are entertained for the most part by people who never go to the theatre at all; and they are propagated, like many other traditional errors, because they represent a part of the truth that looks very much like the whole truth. At intervals the general subject is taken up by by the public prints as a matter of emergency.

A recent article by William Archer in the *Fortnightly Review* set forth the old opinion that the drama had fallen into the hands of the Philistines, and urged upon the accepted novelists of the day, as a thing of duty, to "at least make some effort" in the dramatic form of writing. The *Pall Mall Budget* forthwith addressed letters of inquiry to these same people of genius, informing them that the drama was in distress, that it was no longer literary, and asking them why they didn't do something about it. Their replies have appeared under the description of "Why I Don't Write Plays." It is obvious that, with modifications, there are but two answers to the question: The one, that the writer is not skilled in the requirements of play-writing, and does not wish to abandon a form in which he is skilled and in which he has been successful, in order to learn a new literary trade; the other, in whatever terms the attack may be made, is that the drama is an inferior form to the novel. The first answer is the solution. The second involves all manner of prejudices and misinformation.

A common misapprehension among literary men, that is to say, versifiers and novelists, is that literature is a matter of words, a thing of collocation and orthoëpy; whereas its chief and essential function is to express sentiment and thought, and the composition of an impressive painting involves a like process of thought through which a poet would have to pass in writing on the same incident. The picture may be more effective than the poem. The poem must be read. The picture must be seen. Now, the tendency of the true drama is to symbolize, to present living pictures; while economy in words is one of the pressing needs in vitalizing a strong action. The dramatist, however happy he may be in his diction, knows that the literary trick can only give finish or incidental aid; that a drama is not a literary thing at all, in the sense of being hammered together out of words; and that, in fact, it is no drama unless it remains incomplete in its effectiveness until it is acted. But even if the "literary" part of it be inconsiderable, yet, if it accomplishes a worthy purpose, it is literature.

With this distinction in mind, it is well to turn to some facts in the history of letters that account, in a measure, for some of the misapprehensions. The conditions of the Greek drama were very peculiar, yet its plays were written to be acted, and in tragedy were highly poetic. The *technique* of that stage permitted an ideal union of the literary and the dramatic; but the poetic drama is only one form. In all genuine and bustling comedy,

ancient or modern, the literary element has small part. Plautus was not a man of words. His plays were for the stage. Real life requires the language of the day, and the artificialities of literature are entirely foreign to it, for a good play is life itself.

Again, verse is merely a convenience, and the belief that literature, particularly as it concerns the drama, belongs almost solely to this form of expression has long since been exploded, and has troubled no man, with any appreciation of facts, since the days of the extinct school of Corneille. The abandonment of verse was an emancipation. The drama has not declined; it has simply expanded. It is constantly expanding and gaining new forms and fresh strength. From the Shakesperian standard in the matter of the poetic form it *has* declined. Now, if as a result of Mr. William Archer's invitation the novelists and poets do make an effort, it will be well; for soon or late the poetic drama will again have its triumphs.

There is no divorce between literature and the drama. If the drama and that literature which consists in fine writing are getting wider apart so much the better—for the drama. The play has many limitations, but it has rejected fine writing as one of its indispensable conventionalities.

A play is, in reality, not written, but constructed. So is a novel constructed, but much more loosely; for in many of the best of them are "antres vast" of mere dissertation. It would not be wholly to the purpose here to go into an account of the technical differences between the novel and the drama. It is sufficient that these differences exist. It may be noted that in some particulars, as, for example, in the metaphysical, the novel offers a full opportunity to the writer who explores the soul and analyzes the emotions. Of all this minute verbiage the drama knows absolutely nothing. It is satisfied with facts, and the broad effects that leave refinements and analysis to the critical and the thoughtful who profit by the thing seen. It is useless to discuss the question of the relative merits of the two forms of literature. Each has its limitations. Each requires to be pursued by a writer as an art. Each form even of the drama has its own special limitations, and the writer skilled in farce has neither the natural nor the acquired aptitude for the writing of a tragedy. Is there, then, anything remarkable in the inability of the novelist to write a play—and all kinds of plays?

It is a good indication when you find even a few novelists who are not afraid to frankly say, "I don't know how to write a play."

The common impression, and the one to be gathered from the inquiry of the *Pall Mall Budget*, is that it is a rather easy matter to write a play, and that any literary man could do it, if he only would. There is a great deal of needless unhappiness among men of letters growing out of this false belief. Why should an author be disturbed if he fails in the attempted task? The matter is so simple that this writer, in a recently published book, "The Technique of the Drama," felt that he had incidentally covered the case in these few words:

"The dramatic instinct is essential in addition to a knowledge of *technique*. One may have genius in some other line, like Richelieu in statesmanship, and yet lack the dramatic faculty. On the other hand, a man of no literary turn may instinctively know how to set his dramatic squadron in the field. The reason, no doubt, why so many distinguished poets and novelists—like Tennyson and Dickens—fail in the drama, is because their habits of thought and methods of expression become fixed, and their genius

cannot bring itself to yield to the unyielding domination of dramatic rule. And why should it? The world has gained, rather than lost, by their failure, for what they had to say was said in the appointed way."

And we may go farther and say that it is almost as absurd to expect an artificer in silver, a painter, or a sculptor to write a play, as a novelist who has been in the habit of filling his three volumes with his anatomical studies of the human heart. Is there not enough glory to be gained in the mastery of one art or the pursuit of one career? Why should we expect Bismarck to write a play? Is there really a demand on the part of the public that our novelists write plays? The fame that is earned in successful work for the stage is supplemented by a standing offer of large reward. It is the operation of entirely natural causes that keeps people from writing plays,—that is, successful plays.

If the novelist or the poet wishes to enter the field he must learn the art. In these crowded times there is no room for the work of amateurs. The world's desire is to have all from master hands, and at no time in our history has there been a nearer approach to perfection in form than exists to-day in our acted pieces.

It is a further mistake to believe that the drama is hemmed in by conventionalities. It is, rather, governed by principles, by nature itself, and its limitations are wholesome. Some of the novelists object to the mechanical, the shifting of scenes and the like. They should reflect that their own books are filled with the scenic. One avers that the audiences of the present day are inferior in every way to the people who read books. Another maintains that plays are made to fit actors and not nature, that actors are not equal to the work, and so on. But all such statements merely reflect the accidents and not the essential things of the stage.

The plain fact is that the drama is difficult to handle. Its first requirement is self-abnegation. The author surrenders at the outset all applause to the people who act his plays. His only gratification must be in the perfection of the objective. As an art, play-writing is the exact opposite of writing *currente calâmo*. It is almost a writing backward, from right to left; it is the negative that is to be developed into the positive; an image to be reversed in a glass. It is easy and a delight to some, who have gained the art; difficult to others not entirely practised in it; and impossible to those who know nothing of it, or who will not learn its limitations or submit to them. He is the best writer, dramatist or novelist, who has mastered his form.

Mr. Lucas Malet and Mr. A. T. Quiller Couch say in very much the same terms that they do not propose to begin over again and learn a new trade. But it is this very frankness, conspicuous in these two respondents to the query, that would enable them to loyally accept and work with all possible success under the unyielding principles of the drama.

W. T. PRICE.

AMERICAN CHAUVINISM.

TO BE irrationally hopeful and buoyant, to have an overwhelming estimate of one's value and importance, is the prerogative of the young. But the United States have now passed their national first youth, and have reached a period where their needs, condition and status as a people should be plainly understood. It is, nevertheless, a fact that the American people

are inflated with a national vanity which creates among them a misconception of their country's relative value. Patriotism is a distinctly different sentiment. The mistake is made of attributing to personal and national greatness those wonderful resources at the command of industry, intelligence and enterprise—resources vastly varied, from which flows large prosperity; for energy, foresight and enterprise are distinctively American traits. This accumulation of wealth, which is the cause and criterion of civilization, is not due to exceptional merit or genius on the part of the people.

A scrutiny of the commerce, the industrial and fine arts, and the sciences, in those great European countries which lead in civilization, should force the conviction that the Chauvinism of the American is ill-placed.

The export and import trade of the United States, in proportion to the wealth and opportunities of the population, does not compare favorably with that of England, France, Germany, Belgium or Holland; any of which nations, if they could handle the great staples of the United States, would, by sagacious diplomacy and superior management in shipping and manufacturing, monopolize to themselves the markets of the world. That the western farmer should have been compelled to consume his grain as fuel, while Russia, Italy, Roumania, Servia, and a large area of the internal countries of Europe stood in need of food supplies, is a sufficient comment on the defective organization of the national affairs of these States. The interdiction of American pork from Germany, on the score of its unsound quality, was thus a mortification to American pride.

Adulterations and cheating in the preparation of food supplies and goods have often impaired the American reputation for honesty in trade.

In the matter of fine workmanship in the industrial arts, the American manufacturer has recourse to the European workman.

To one who has wandered through the cathedrals, imperial palaces, art galleries, and other edifices scattered throughout the old world, of Europe, Turkey, Japan, and the East, the greatest American achievement in architecture appears plain and inartistic by comparison. A cathedral whose foundation was laid in 1284, and upon which, during all these centuries, the most exquisite skill, genius, and money have been lavished, must of necessity surpass any conception of the American mind.

Nor are the engineering feats accomplished by us more magnificent or startling than those of other people. Some of our great bridges, jetties, and railroad constructions claim admiration, but the tunnelling of the Alps and the Thames, the Severn and the Mersey, the Suez Canal, the dikes and and drainage of Holland, the Siberian Railway, and that which traverses the Himalayas, the irrigation of Sahara, and other stupendous European undertakings, are of equal magnitude to our own, if not superior to them.

The basis of our prosperity rests upon our agriculture. The great staple products are the sources from which the manufacturer, capitalist and merchant, the railroads, the exporter and the importer, all draw their prosperity. Agriculture, therefore, should demand the most scientific attention. It is of recent date only that our various products have received an advanced method of treatment. The results attained by such culture in Germany and France have been greater to the acre than in our States. At the approaching World's Fair in Chicago, the displays from other countries of the skill and genius of their people should serve as a practical lesson that the Chauvinism which would boast of all things American had best be abandoned.

It is to be regretted that there exists a super-sensitive objection among us which would debar all scrutiny and all comparison; and will not permit the concession that other nations have accomplished greater and more marvellous undertakings than our own, or that other countries, in proportion to their opportunities and resources, are more prosperous and better governed than are these States. This unwise habit of stifling criticism among us has worked infinite mischief to this country. Any dispassionate judgment passed upon the inferiority of the American production or on the mismanagement of American affairs is discountenanced as being unpatriotic and fulsome, and unwarranted adulation is the only expression of opinion tolerated. And yet nothing is more purely patriotic or profoundly judicious than just censure and correct criticism. Such condemnation is utilized and considered in Europe. Until the American citizen can welcome dispassionate analysis errors will abound and enlightened progress will be retarded.

The most serious blunder common to these States is the complaisant belief that our present government is peculiarly beneficent, admirable and perfect. Many of its enactments are as objectionable, practically, as the theory on which it is founded is admirable.

Of late we have had attempted legislation by Congress, alarming from the reckless injury which might be inflicted on the most vital interests of the people, and sorrowfully appalling by reason of the foreshadowing of future endeavors of a like nature. A Congressional postal law curtailed the liberty of the press, the very keystone of American liberty. The entire trade and commerce of this Union now stands trembling, awaiting with hope and with bated breath the defeat of the pending anti-options bill.

A grave and alarming antagonism between capital and labor has been engendered and brought about by crude, partial and unjust federal laws enacted for favored industries. The storm thus evoked has not yet gathered its full strength. The labor strikes at the Homestead mills are potential of future and still more dangerous troubles, which will assuredly test to their utmost the solidity of American institutions and the breadth of American leadership and patriotism. And it is yet uncertain whether the monied power will gain the ascendancy, and, casting aside all reserve, establish its hold permanently and autocratically upon the destinies of this country; or whether the sober and conservative element may, by consolidated action and a return to a safer interpretation of the fundamental laws governing these confederated States, and, by equalizing legislation, effect a pause towards an approaching catastrophe. The summing up of these facts proves the political degeneracy of our present epoch. It remains to be demonstrated whether the party leaders have the ability to cope successfully with the stupendous issues now pending.

Nor can it be denied that the arts and sciences are still far behind those of other and older peoples. It is not the writer's intention to state that nothing admirable exists in these States. American artists have acquired a just fame of late years, and their genius is admitted by all. The American inventive genius is also conspicuous. But for the admirable conservative daily press these States would have been, ere this, remorselessly put under the heel of an iron despotism from which rescue would have been impossible.. Our press is the most satisfactory part of our present civilization. The American periodical and review demand all praise. Beyond this, an unbiased judgment will only see great natural advantages and an energetic money-making people, who have accomplished much.

Whether they be of superior intelligence, vigor, and worth, will be demonstrated within the next few years when the present uncertain stage is passed, and when these States will either have returned to a pure democratic government, to honest trade, and to great prosperity, or will be held in the grasp of a despotic money oligarchy, with a standing army to enforce its authority, and a pauper-working class to do its behests. The triumph of the true principles of our government, which maintain the welfare of the people, or the triumph of those which take from the masses to add to the wealth of the rich, will turn the scales and make Americans a success or a failure.

Therefore there is room for apprehension and anxiety; but the excessive Chauvinism which mars the American character, otherwise clear sighted and admirable, sees nothing of it.

S. RHETT ROMAN.

CRITICISM CRITICISED.

CERTAINLY every critical writer on music, the fine arts, the drama, literature, or anything else, has a right to do his work in his own way. He must needs do it so. Does it not seem often, however, that literary, musical, dramatic, fine arts, or any other sort of journalistic criticism nowadays, done emphatically in a man's or a woman's "own way," means the man's or woman's *not* doing it? Is there not, day by day, in our journals too much of the vague and negative and counsel-darkening criticism for the given literary matter or art matter to get the praise or blame needed, in this or that responsible quarter?

Let us reason together a bit. For what is a newspaper or other professional critic set to reviewing a book, sent to the concert, the opera, the play, the picture exhibition? To judge of their merits, of *their* merits—and to say what he thinks just as independently, sharply, and discriminately as he can: independently, be it observed, of everybody and of everything impertinent to his immediate function. For that purpose is his space given him in his newspaper or other periodical. Characterize that matter before him he must. Stick to the text of that book, that play, that opera, that picture he must, and to the way in which A and B or C have done their work in it. Was it a good book of its kind—a good play—a good symphony or a poor one? and, as far as is practicable, why was the business good, bad, or indifferent? Characterization above all things is his *métier*.

Now, if the professional critic disregards this primary duty, consciously or unconsciously, he is in fault. He may be learned. But he must make his learning merely the vantage ground for his sure foothold in his task. He must not write a general or special essay on the topic. He must not give his reader an intolerable deal of excellent didactics, quite matter out of place, to a pennyworth of his opinion on the things before him and them. His preamble must not be the kite and his criticism the tail. He must not write a vast portico of an essay on some related matters—and knock together behind it some little hut of his criticism, his newspaper's criticism, that primarily its readers want. If he does this—and too many men do it—he is either troubled with a sad, bad eye for proportion, or else he is deliberately dishonest. He is avoiding his duty speciously and perhaps gracefully; but he avoids it. It is to be suspected that he is tying up his knife of analysis in flowers. It is edgeless. He is pretending to criticize when he is only essaying.

Surely this is plain common-sense. In critical writing Hamlet's remark is the best guide—"the play's the thing;" or rather the history, the biography, the novel, the opera, the picture, the statue, each is the thing in which the critic must do most of his speaking to his public. Essays and sermons neither keep nor hinder, nor kill, nor cure, under such journalistic conditions. Criticism does. Never was honest, blunt, sincere, well-considered, terse, critical writing more needed in this country than now. May we have more of it! May our younger journalists think more of achieving it day by day, month by month! The office of the journalistic critic is not the circumlocution office. To write "all around" a thing, yet never touch it to the quick, hints at pedantry, cowardice, or self-interest. It conflicts too much with the critic's first duty—I had almost written whole duty—to speak the truth; a duty that should be his greatest pleasure. He must not tack in it; but go about it at all times, tersely, pointedly, without fear or favor, regardless of personal enmities, or friendships, or advantages, or disadvantages. He must not avail himself of his knowledge of everything relating to the topic to furnish his "copy." Better hit hard than hit too soft.

I know of no better gospel of criticism in literature, art, anything, than this. It covers a wide field, brief as its principle or warning is, just as the enchanted pavilion of the Peri Banu could be held in the palm or be made to shelter a host. The cuttle-fish with his ample sepia bag is the allegory, consciously or unconsciously, of too much of what fills the critic's space in the metropolitan journal all the world over just now. Surely it may profitably for letters and art be no longer pertinent.

E. IRENÆUS STEVENSON.

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH VOLUME.

OF THE

North American Review.

ABBOTT, SAMUEL W. Safeguards Against the Cholera, 497.
Abraham Lincoln as a Strategist, 53, 160.
Adventures of a Necromancer, Some, 418.
Alcoholism, Is It Increasing Among American Women? 731.
American Chauvinism, 756.
AMADI GIOVANNI. The Pope at Home, 193.
ANDREWS, E. B. Are There Too Many of Us? 596.
Anecdote, The Illuminating Power of, 347.
Apropos of Cholera, 376.
Are There Too Many of Us? 596.
ARGYLL, THE DUKE OF. English Elections and Home Rule, 129.
Art Students in Italy, 248.
Art Work, Women in the Field of, 381.
Atmosphere, The Hygiene of the, 446.

BALFOUR, ARTHUR J. The New House of Commons and the Irish Question, 641.
BALFOUR, LADY FRANCES. A Last Word on London Society, 219.
Ballot Reform, A Campaign for, 684.
BARR, AMELIA E. Not in Society, 302.
BENT, S. ARTHUR. The Illuminating Power of Anecdote, 347.
Bismarck and the Emperor, 510.
BLAINE, JAMES G. The Presidential Campaign of 1892, 513.
BLAKE, H. A. Opportunities for Young Men in Jamaica, 662.
BLAKE, MARY ELIZABETH. A Tilt at a Black Monster, 117.
BLAND, R. P. What Shall the Ratio Be? 9.
BLIND, KARL. Swiss and French Election Methods, 575.
Blow at the Freedom of the Press, A, 691.
BOYESEN, H. H. The Scandinavian in the United States, 526.
BRADBURY, H. B. The Naturalization Problem, 638.
BRANDI, S. M. When Is the Pope Infallible? 652.
Bright, John. Reminiscences of, 315.
BRUCE, W. CABELL. Lynch Law in the South, 379.
Buffalo Strike, The, 407.
BUNNELL, NEWTON L. Farm Organization, 251.
Business in Presidential Years, 210, 426.

Campaign, Organized Labor in the, 91.
Campaign, Paramount Questions of the, 477.
Campaign of 1892, The Presidential, 513.
CARTER, SUSAN N. Women in the Field of Art Work, 381.
Cathedrals, The Use of, 84.
Chauvinism, American, 756.
Cholera, Apropos of, 376.
Cholera, Oriental Pilgrimages and, 126.
Cholera, Safeguards Against the, 483.
Cholera, What It Costs Commerce, 545.
CLARETIE, JULES. The Shudder in Literature, 136.
Commons, The New House of, and the Irish Question, 641.
Congresses Contrasted, Two, 227.
Conventions, Party, 237.
CRAWFORD, J. M. Europe at the World's Fair, 626.
CRISPI, EX-PRIME MINISTER, The Situation in Italy, 106.
Criticism Criticised, 759.
CROSBY, J. SCHUYLER. Art Students in Italy, 248.
CROTHERS, T. D. Is Alcoholism Increasing Among American Women? 731.
CURTIS, GEORGE TICKNOR. The Homestead Strike, 364.
CUSACK, M. F. The Deaconess Movement, 245.

DALZELL, JOHN. What Shall the Ratio Be? 14.
DAWSON, J. WILLIAM. Prehistoric Times in Egypt and Palestine, 69.
Deaconess Movement, The, 245.
Democracy, Erratic National Tariff Platforms of the, 268.
Democratic Outlook, The, 751.
Divorce: From a French Point of View, 721.

DOANE, WILLIAM CROSWELL. Politics and the Pulpit, 41; The Excise Law and the Saloons, 395.
DODGE, THEODORE A. The Horse in America, 667.
DOUGLASS, FREDERICK. Lynch Law in the South, 17.
Drama, A Plain Talk on the, 308.
DUNRAVEN, EARL. International Yachting, 706.

EDSON, CYRUS. Apropos of Cholera, 376; Safeguards Against the Cholera, 501.
EDWARDS, W. H. Europe at the World's Fair, 623.
EGGLESTON, W. G. Oriental Pilgrimages and Cholera, 126.
Egypt and Palestine, Prehistoric Times in, 69.
Electioneering Methods in England, 338.
Election Methods, Swiss and French, 575.
Electoral System, The French, 466.
England, Electioneering Methods in, 338.
England, The Foreign Policy of, 430.
English Elections and Home Rule, The, 129.
English Reporter, The, 118.
Erratic National Tariff Platforms of the Democracy, 268.
Ethics of Great Strikes, The, 514.
Europe at the World's Fair, 623.
EUSTACE, JENNIE A. Objections to Theatrical Life, 631.
Excise Law and the Saloons, The, 395.

Farm Organization, 251.
Floods, Our Recent, 149.
FORBES, ARCHIBALD. Abraham Lincoln as a Strategist, 53, 160.
Forecast of Mr. Gladstone's New Administration, A, 293.
Foreign Policy of England, The, 430.
FOSS, CYRUS D. Politics and the Pulpit, 536.
French Electoral System, The, 466.

Gambling and Cheating in Ancient Rome, 97.
Garza Raid and Its Lessons, The, 321.
GLADSTONE, W. E. A Vindication of Home Rule, 385.
Gladstone's New Administration, A Forecast of Mr., 293.
GODKIN, E. L. A Month of Quarantine, 737.
GOMPERS, SAMUEL. Organized Labor in the Campaign, 91.
GREGORY, ROBERT. The Use of Cathedrals, 84.
GRUBB, E. BURD. A Campaign for Ballot Reform, 684.

HAINES, H. S. Railway Safety Appliances, 121.
HAMILTON, GAIL. The Point of View, 171; An Open Letter to Her Majesty, the Queen, 257.
HANSBROUGH, H. C. What Shall the Ratio Be? 6.
HARRITY, W. F. The Democratic Outlook, 551.
HERRMANN, A. Some Adventures of a Necromancer, 418.
Home Rule, A Vindication of, 385.
Home Rule, English Elections and, 129.
Homestead Strike, The, 355.
Horse in America, The, 667.
House of Commons and the Irish Question, The, 641.
HOWE, M. A. DE WOLFE, JR. A Tax on Tales, 508.
HUGHES, T. P. Sanitation Versus Quarantine, 636.
HUTCHINSON, WOODS. A Time to Be Out of Doors, 253.
Hygiene of the Atmosphere, The, 446.

Ignorance, Innocence Versus, 287.
Illuminating Power of Anecdote, The, 347.
INGERSOLL, R. G. Thomas Paine, 181; Ernest Renan, 608.
Innocence Versus Ignorance, 287.
Insane, General Paresis of the, 744.
International Yachting, 706.
Irish Question, The New House of Commons and the, 641.
Issue, The Real, 401.
Italy, The Situation in, 106.

Jamaica, Opportunities for Young Men in, 662.
JENKINS, W. T. Quarantine at New York, 585.
Jeune, Lady, on London Society, 25.
JEUNE, LADY. "London Society" and Its Critics, 456.

KENMARE, THE NUN OF. The Deaconess movement, 245.
KIMBALL, ARTHUR REED. The Religious Issue in Politics, 633.

Labor in the Campaign, Organized, 91.
LABOUCHERE, H., The Foreign Policy of England, 430.
Lady Jeune on London Society, 25.
LANCIANI, RODOLFO. Gambling and Cheating in Ancient Rome, 97.
Last Word on London Society, A, 219.
Letter to Her Majesty, the Queen, An Open, 257.
Lincoln, Abraham, as a Strategist, 53, 160.
Literary Men, Playwrights and, 754.
Literature, The Shudder in, 136.
LOCKWOOD, SAMUEL. The Hygiene of the Atmosphere, 446.
London Society, Lady Jeune on, 25; A Last Word on, 219; "London Society" and Its Critics, 456.
LOWELL, A. LAWRENCE. Politics and the Weather, 506.
LUCY, H. W. Electioneering Methods in England, 338.
Lynch Law in the South, 17, 379.

MALLALIEU, W. F. Politics and the Pulpit, 44.
MALLOCK, W. H. Lady Jeune on London Society, 25.
MANSFIELD, RICHARD. A Plain Talk on the Drama, 308.
MCCARTHY, JUSTIN. A Forecast of Mr. Gladstone's New Administration, 293.
MCLAREN, CHARLES. Reminiscences of John Bright, 315.
MERRIAM, WILLIAM R. The Needs of the New Northwest, 37.
Month of Quarantine, A, 737.
MORGAN, JOHN T. Party Conventions, 237.
MORRILL, JUSTIN S. Erratic National Tariff Platforms of the Democracy, 268.

NAQUET, A. The French Electoral System, 466; Divorce: From a French Point of View, 721.
Naturalization Problem, The, 638.
Necromancer, Some Adventures of a, 418.
Needs of the New Northwest, The, 37.
New England, The Peaceful Conquest of, 124.
Not in Society, 302.

OATES, W. C. The Homestead Strike, 355.
Objections to Theatrical Life, 631.
Open Letter to Her Majesty, the Queen, An, 257.
Opportunities for Young Men in Jamaica, 662.
Organized Labor in the Campaign, 91.
O'REILLY, BERNARD. How to Solve the School Question, 569.
Oriental Pilgrimages and Cholera, 126.
Our Recent Floods, 149.

Paine, Thomas, 181.
Palestine, Prehistoric Times in Egypt and, 69.
Paramount Questions of the Campaign, 477.
Paresis of the Insane, General, 744.
Party Conventions, 237.
Party, Wanted, A New, 592.
Peaceful Conquest of New England, The, 124.
PENNOYER, SYLVESTER. Paramount Questions of the Campaign, 477.
Plain Talk on the Drama, A, 308.
PLAYFAIR, LORD. Waste Products Made Useful, 560.
Playrights and Literary Men, 754.
Point of View, The, 171.
Politics and the Pulpit, 41, 536.
Politics and the Weather, 506.
Politics, The Religious Issue in, 633.
Pope at Home, The, 196.
Pope Infallible? When Is the, 652.
PORRITT, EDWARD. The English Reporter, 118.
POWDERLY, T. V. The Homestead Strike, 370; Wanted; A New Party, 592.
POWELL, J. W. Our Recent Floods, 149.
Prehistoric Times in Egypt and Palestine, 69.
Presidential Campaign of 1892, The, 513.
Presidential Years, Business in, 210, 426.
Press, A Blow at the Freedom of the, 694.
PRICE, W. T. Playrights and Literary Men, 754.

Quarantine, A Month of, 737.
Quarantine at New York, 585.
Quarantine, Sanitation Versus, 636.

Railway Safety Appliances, 121.
REED, T. B. Two Congresses Contrasted. 227.
Reform, A Campaign for Ballot, 634.
Religious Issue in Politics, The, 633.
Reminiscences of John Bright, 315.
Renan, Ernest, 608.
Reporter, The English, 118.
RIVES, AMÉLIE, Innocence Versus Ignorance, 287.
Rome, Gambling and Cheating in Ancient, 97.
ROMAN, S. RHETT. American Chauvinism, 756.
ROMERO, M. The Garza Raid and Its Lessons, 324.

Safeguards Against the Cholera, 483.
Sanitation Versus Quarantine, 636.
Scandinavian in the United States, The, 526.
School Question, How to Solve the, 569.
SEARS, J. H. Bismarck and the Emperor, 510.
Shudder in Literature, The, 136.
Situation in Italy, The, 106.
SMITH, CHARLES STEWART. Business in Presidential Years, 426.
Society, Lady Jeune on London, 25; A Last Word on, 219; London Society and Its Critics, 456.
Society, Not in, 302.
South, Lynch Law in the, 17; 379.
SPRINGER, W. M. What Shall the Ratio Be? 4.
STANTON, THEODORE. The French Electoral System, 466.
STEVENSON, E. IRENÆUS. Criticism Criticised, 759.
STEWART, W. M. What Shall the Ratio Be? 1.
Strike, The Buffalo, 407.
Strike, The Homestead, 355.
Strikes, The Ethics of Great, 504.
Swiss and French Election Methods, 575.

Tariff Plank at Chicago, The, 280.
Tariff Platforms of the Democracy, Erratic National, 268.
TAYLOR, HANNIS. A Blow at the Freedom of the Press, 694.
Tax on Tales, A, 508.
Theatrical Life, Objections to, 631.
THURBER, F. B. Business in Presidential Years, 210.
Tilt at a Black Monster, A, 117.
Time to Be Out of Doors, A, 253.
Two Congresses Contrasted, 227.

Use of Cathedrals, The, 84.

VEST, G. G. The Real Issue, 401.
Vindication of Home Rule, A, 385.
VOORHEES, THEODORE. The Buffalo Strike, 407.

"Wages of Sin." 744.
WALSH, GEORGE ETHELBERT. The Ethics of Great Strikes, 504.
Wanted; A New Party, 592.
WARD, J. H. The Peaceful Conquest of New England, 124.
Waste Products Made Useful, 560.
What Cholera Costs Commerce, 545.
What Shall the Ratio Be? 1.
When Is the Pope Infallible? 652.
WILLIAMS, HENRY SMITH. "Wages of Sin." 744.
WILSON, CHARLES G. Safeguards Against the Cholera, 491.
WILSON, W. L. The Tariff Plank at Chicago, 280.
WIMAN, ERASTUS. What Cholera Costs Commerce, 545
Woman? Is Alcoholism Increasing Among American, 731.
Women in the Field of Art Work, 381.
World's Fair, Europe at the, 623.
WYMAN, WALTER. Safeguards Against the Cholera, 483.
Yachting, International, 706.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

MAR 17 1914